

1738

Samuel Holyoke

4226. cc 48.



Dr. Wigglesworth's
LECTURES
ON THE
Imputation of Adam's first Sin
TO HIS
POSTERITY.



BRITISH MUSEUM

The Wiggins

of the

of the

of the



POST

BRITISH MUSEUM

A N
Enquiry into the Truth
O F T H E
Imputation of the Guilt
O F
A D A M's first Sin
T O H I S
P O S T E R I T Y.

Being the Substance of several private Lectures in
Harvard College, on the third Article in the sixth
Chapter of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*.

By *Edward Wigglesworth*, D. D.
And *Hollisian* Professor of Divinity at *Cambridge*.

B O S T O N ;

Printed by *J. Draper*, for *D. Henchman* over against
the Brick-Meeting-House in Cornhil. 1 7 3 8.





THE P R E F A C E.



AS the Subject of the following Enquiry is of considerable Importance in it self ; so it is perhaps of more upon account of the Consequences, which Men generally draw from it ; Forasmuch as it is observable, that most Men determine their Thoughts concerning several other Matters of no small Moment ; very much according as they settle this Point in their Minds. It is also a Subject about which (in private Conversation) I have observed as many inquisitive tho'tful Persons to be in suspense, as about almost any one controverted Point in Divinity : For such Persons frequently appear, on one hand loath to give up a Doctrine, which they have been educated in the Belief of, and for which they have some considerable things to plead ; and yet on the other hand they seem hardly able to bear up against the Current of our English Writers of the present, and latter Part of the last Century, who are almost all against it. Moreover it is a Subject, which hath not been treated of, otherwise than incidentally (at least so far as I have had Opportunity to observe) in any Book now commonly passing among us. By these Considerations I have been induced to hope, that the publishing of the following Pages might prove both acceptable and profitable to many serious Enquirers into the important Truths of divine Revelation.

When this Subject first fell in my Way on my publick Tuesday Lecture, I was very much in suspense about it my self. And therefore, for my own Satisfaction, as well as for the Satisfaction of those who were to hear me, I determined, by the Help of God, to collect the principal Things I could meet with in others, on both Sides of the Question ; to set them one over against another in the most likely Manner to cast a Light on the Controversy ; to add all the Force I might find my self able, to the Argument on each Side ; and then, to make up an impartial Judgment upon the whole, according to the Light that God should give me.
This

THE PREFACE.

This Method almost necessarily led me to speak, for the most Part, not in my own Name; but in the Name of the contending Parties: and prevented me from delivering any absolute Judgment of my own, till near the End of my last Discourse upon the Subject. The same Method, for the same Reason, I remember I have gone into upon one other Controversy, and I think never upon more than one: which I mention here, only that I may correct a Mistake, which I understand some have fallen into about my Conduct in these Lectures; as if it were a common thing with me, only to exhibit the Opinions and Arguments of other Men upon controverted Points; and keep my own to my self. A Mistake, which I charitably suppose some may have too rashly gone into themselves, and reported to others, upon their hearing only now and then a Discourse on a Subject, without giving themselves the Trouble of attending the whole Series of the Argument upon it. But to return from this Digression,

When I began in my private Lectures on Wednesday and Thursday Mornings to explain the Westminster Confession of Faith to my Pupils, this Subject was quickly bro't in my Way again, by the Article prefixed to the following Enquiry. I then carefully review'd, what I had formerly said upon it at my publick Lecture; and (having the Advantage of some Books which I had not seen at that Time) tho' I found no Reason to change the Opinion which I had settled before, yet I found Reason to leave out many things which I had formerly offered, and to substitute many others in the Room of them, which I tho't to be of more Importance. So that this Enquiry, as it now appears, is, I suppose, more than one half altered from what was deliver'd at my publick Lectures. However by having them before me, I was led insensibly into the same Method (tho' I had not the same Reason for it now, which I had then) of speaking generally in the Name of the adverse Parties, and not in my own. If any Reader already acquainted with the Controversy should be offended at this, because he may meet with diverse Things, which may appear new to him upon the Subject, I desire he would consider this little Treatise, as of much the same Nature with a Dialogue, in which the supposed Speakers are a Calvinist and an Arminian. And into this Form I sometimes tho't to have cast it, before I made it publick; but the distressed Circumstances of my Family for more than a Twelve Month past, till very lately, and the broken State of my own Health, for a considerable Part of the Time, have forbidden my prosecuting that Design.

I hope no Man will have Reason to complain, that I have father'd any thing upon either Party inconsistent with their avowed Principles; or that I have concealed any Part of the Strength of either, with respect to these Arguments and Objections I have borrowed from them. If I have
done

The P R E F A C E.

done either of these things in any Instance, it hath been for want of better Judgment ; and not for want of sincere Intentions.

If any should think it strange, that I don't absolutely declare my own Opinion upon the Merits of the Cause, till I come near to the Conclusion of the whole Matter (beside what I have already said to prevent Surprise, or Offence at this) I pray them to consider, that they themselves will probably reap a double Advantage from it, as they will find themselves hereby drawn on to weigh the Argument on both Sides with less Prejudice, and more Attention, whatever their previous Opinion may be: And if it shall please God to succeed this Essay so far ; as to reduce any that are wandering from the Truth ; or to settle the Minds of any that are wavering about it, I shall have my Desire, and I hope God will have the Glory.

I shall add no more, but my earnest Request for the Readers Prayers, that God would graciously lead me from Time to Time into a clear Apprehension of divine Truths ; that he would enable me to represent them to the Satisfaction and Establishment of those, who will probably hereafter be the Dispensers of them, to his People thro' the Land ; and that he would strengthen me to bear the great Application, which my own Insufficiency, and the Importance of the Duties of the Trust reposed in me, call for.

Cambridge, Sept. 1.

1737.

Edward Wigglesworth:



Advertisement.

THE Reader is desired to take Notice, That upon a Review of the following Sheets, as they came from the Press, I am apprehensive that I may have mistaken the Meaning of one Passage cited from Mr. Chubb, p. 52. His Words are, *They had transgressed the Law of Nature, or the Law given to Noah.* When I was writing, I supposed, that by *the Law of Nature, or the Law given to Noah,* he intended the same thing. And upon such a Supposition, when I came to rehearse this Passage, p. 60. I do it in the following Words, *the Law of Nature given to Noah, as this Gentleman speaks;* and upon it I remark in the Margin, *He should have said given to Adam, unless he thinks the Men of the old World were not Sinners.* But I am now sensible, that Mr. Chubb's Words may admit of another Meaning, that he might intend the Particle *or* disjunctively, as if he had said, *They had transgressed, either the Law of Nature, or the Law given to Noah.* And if this was his Intention (as it might be, tho' I am not satisfied it was) then my Marginal Note above mentioned is groundless; but still the Argument in the Body of the Page holds alike good against him, which ever way he intended the above cited Expression.





AN
Enquiry into the Truth
OF THE
Imputation of *Adam's* first Sin
TO HIS
POSTERITY:

In several Lectures upon the *Confession of Faith*
composed by the Reverend *Assembly of Divines*
at *Westminster*,

CHAP. VI. Article 3.

*They being the Root of all Mankind, the
Guilt of this Sin was imputed, and the
same Death in Sin and corrupted Na-
ture conveyed to all their Posterity, de-
scending from them by ordinary Genera-
tion.*



IN the preceeding Article we had an
Account of the unhappy Conse-
quences of the Sin of eating the for-
bidden Fruit, to our first Parents
themselves, namely, That by this Sin
they fell from their original Righteousness
and Communion with God, and so became dead in Sin,
and

2 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

and wholly defiled in all their Faculties and Powers of Soul and Body. In the Article now before us we are told, what Mischiefs the same Sin hath bro't upon their Posterity also ; viz. That they being the Root of all Mankind, the Guilt of this Sin was imputed, and the same Death in Sin and corrupted Nature conveyed to all their Posterity descending from them by ordinary Generation. In which Words we may take Notice of three Things, viz.

I. That the Guilt of the Sin of our first Parents, in eating the forbidden Fruit, was imputed. And,

II. That the same Death in Sin and corrupted Nature which befell our first Parents upon their eating this Fruit, was conveyed to all their Posterity descending from them by ordinary Generation. And

III. That one Ground of both these, was their being the Root of all Mankind.

I. That the Guilt of the Sin of our first Parents, in eating the forbidden Fruit, was imputed to all their Posterity descending from them by ordinary Generation. The Article says, To all their Posterity by ordinary Generation, that it may not include our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, who was conceived in the Womb of the Virgin Mary, not by Virtue of the Blessing pronounced on our first Parents before the Fall, Be fruitful and multiply, &c ; but by Virtue of the Promise after the Fall, concerning the Seed of the Woman, which should bruise the Serpent's Head : And therefore he did not descend from our first Parents in the Way of ordinary Generation ; but was formed of the Substance of his Virgin Mother, by the Power of God, as immediately, and in a Way as extraordinary as Adam himself was formed out of the Dust of the Ground. Upon which

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 3

which Account he was no more liable to have the Guilt of the Sin of our first Parents imputed, or a corrupted Nature from them conveyed to him, than a new World † of Men would be, should God create them out of nothing, or out of the Dust of the Ground; which would be no more miraculous or supernatural, than it was to form the human Nature of Christ in the Womb of a Virgin. Now as Persons so formed, would not be concerned in our first Parents Sin, or Fall, whatever Similitude there might be of Nature; even so our Saviour was not concerned therein. And as an Argument that his extraordinary and miraculous Conception exempted him from any Concern in the Sin and Fall of our first Parents, it is observable that the Angel, who gave the first Intimation hereof, when he tells the blessed Virgin his Mother, Luk. i. 35. *That the Holy Ghost should come upon her, and the Power of the Highest should overshadow her,* says also, *Therefore that holy Thing that shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God*: thereby implying, that in his first Formation he was holy, and consequently had no Concern in the Guilt of the Sin of our first Parents, or in the Corruption of Nature transmitted from them to their Posterity, because of the manner of his Formation or Conception. Thus much I thought needful to premise about the Importance of that Expression, *To all their Posterity descending from them* by ordinary Generation.

The next Thing must be to enquire into the Meaning and Truth of the Assertion, viz. *That the Guilt of the Sin of our first Parents in eating the forbidden Fruit was imputed to all their Posterity so descend-*

† Vid. *Ridgley's Body of Divinity*, p. 331. Vol. 1.

4 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

ing from them. And here I shall not be solicitous to examine, whether it was the Guilt of the Sin of *both our first Parents*, or of *Adam only*, which was so imputed? The *Reverend Assembly* which drew up the *Confession of Faith* now before us, seem not to have been curious concerning this Matter. For tho' in the *Article* at this time under our Consideration, they express themselves so, as to include the Guilt of the Sin of *Eve*, as well as *that of Adam*; yet in *both their Catechisms* they refer the Guilt of Mankind to the *Sin of Adam only*, saying that all Mankind sinned in him, and fell with him in his first Transgression. And tho' it be manifest from the Scriptures, that *Eve* tho't herself under the same Prohibition which *Adam* was, with respect to the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, when she told the Serpent, Gen. iii. 2, 3. *We may eat of the Fruit of the Trees of the Garden; but of the Fruit of the Tree in the midst of the Garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die:* And though it seems also evident from the Sentence passed upon her for her Sin, Gen. iii. 16. That she was not mistaken in her Apprehensions about the extent of the Divine Prohibition: Yet it is to be observed, that the Scriptures of the New Testament, generally if not always, speak of the unhappy Consequences of the first Transgression, as the Fruits of the Sin of *Adam only*. Thus they tell us, That *by Man came Death, that in Adam all die* †; that *by one Man Sin entered into the World*, and that *by one Man's Disobedience many were made Sinners* ||. I shall choose therefore to follow the Stile of the Scriptures, rather than that of the Article before us, and speak of it as the Guilt of the Sin of *Adam in eating the for-*

† 1 Cor. 15. 21, 22. || Rom. 5. 12, 19.

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 5

bidden Fruit, which was imputed to all his Posterity descending from him by ordinary Generation.

Now to come at the Meaning of this Assertion, we may observe ;

That Guilt is an Obligation on a Person to suffer deserved Punishment for Sin. It takes its Rise from Sin, and leads to Punishment as a thing deserved by it. So that to be guilty of Sin, is to be bound over to Punishment for it. And to have the Guilt of any Sin imputed, is for the Person to whom it is imputed to be some way or other justly liable to Punishment on the Account of it. And therefore for the Guilt of the Sin of *Adam* to be imputed to his Posterity, is for them to be bound to sustain the Penalty of it. ' *Adam's Sin* is become *theirs*, and ' that in the full Demerit of it, so far as it is a ' Transgression of the Law, and Breach of the ' Covenant : And it brings his Posterity under the ' Desert of the Wrath of God, and they are *legally* ' accounted Sinners. Though they have not committed Sin in their own Persons ; yet because ' their Persons were *legally* in him, as the Person ' of the Debtor is in the Surety, or the Person of ' the Prince in the Ambassador ; hence it is all put ' down upon *their* Account, as *legally* as it is upon ' *Adam's*. They stand forth as Delinquents, and ' are bound to answer for that Sin. His Act of ' Treason hath tainted all his Blood and Posterity ' deriving from him †.

Thus the Imputation of the Guilt of *Adam's* first Sin to his Posterity is explained by the Assertors of it. But concerning the *Truth* of this Doctrine, we may observe, *without looking back to Antiquity,*

† Vid. Willard's Cat. Lect. p. 196.

6 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

that there hath been great Disputing in later times between the *Disciples of Arminius* and others upon one Hand, and the *Divines commonly called Calvinists* on the other : I say the *Divines commonly called Calvinists*, because I think the celebrated *Calvin himself* in the Chapter of *Original Sin* in his *Institutions*, says nothing expresly of the *Imputation* of Adam's first Sin to his Posterity. Nor do I find, that his Opinion concerning this Matter can be gathered from his other Writings, by any thing but pretty remote and doubtful Consequences. * However those *Divines*, who are in the same Sentiments with *Calvin*, in most other Points, are generally agreed in the Belief of this Doctrine. But the Truth or Falseness of it is not to be determined by the Authority of Names, but by the Strength of the Reasons for, or against it. And therefore I shall proceed,

1. To state the Question ; that we may form a right Notion of the Point in Dispute. And

2. I shall exhibit the principal Arguments and Objections of the contending Parties for and against the Imputation of Adam's first Sin to all his Posterity by ordinary Generation.

1. Then, Concerning the State of the Question it is to be observed,

1. That the Dispute is not, Whether the Sin of Adam is said to be imputed to us, because that by Reason of

* I am sensible that *Turretine* labours hard in his *Institutions*, Vol. 1. p. 691. to prove that *Calvin* held the Doctrine of the Imputation ; but the Passages cited by him for that Purpose from *Calvin's* Writings don't appear to me sufficient to put the Matter out of Doubt.

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 7

original Sin dwelling in us, we deserve to be treated as if we had committed Adam's Sin our selves? But, Whether the actual Sin of Adam is really so imputed unto all, as that upon the Account of it all are deemed guilty, and must either suffer Punishment for it, or at least are liable so to do. * Again the Calvinists observe ||

2. That the Punishment which the Sin of Adam brings upon us, is either *Privative* or *Positive*. That the former is the want and Privation of original Righteousness; and the latter is Death, both temporal and eternal; and in general, all those Evils to which Sinners are obnoxious. Now say they, tho' the *positive* Punishment necessarily from the very Nature of the Thing follows upon the *privative*, unless the Mercy of God interpose and prevent; yet it ought by no Means to be confounded with it: For the Imputation of the Sin of Adam is the immediate Cause of the *privative* Punishment, or of the loss of original Righteousness; and therefore is of necessity in order of Nature antecedent to any Consideration of our natural Corruption: whereas we cannot be obnoxious to the *positive* Punishment, or to temporal and eternal Death, till after we are born with a corrupt Nature derived from Adam down to us: And therefore this *positive* Punishment being consequent upon the hereditary Corruption of our Natures, may possibly have an immediate Respect to that; and so be founded only remotely in the Imputation of Adam's first Sin. In a Word, what the Calvinists maintain is,

That the first actual Sin of Adam is imputed to all his Posterity by ordinary Generation, antecedently to any Re-

8 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

gard to the Corruption of human Nature. On the other hand their Adversaries, either deny any Imputation at all, or admit only such an Imputation as is consequent upon a view of the hereditary Corruption derived to us from *Adam*, and as is founded in it. For some of them † judge, that by a Participation of this Corruption, we communicate with *Adam* in his Sin, and habitually consent to it, and therefore deserve to be reckoned Sinners together with him for it. But these Things may suffice for the State of the Question in dispute. It is time that I now proceed to the second Thing proposed, which was,

2. *To exhibit the principal Arguments and Objections of the contending Parties for, and against the Imputation of Adam's first Sin to all his Posterity by ordinary Generation, antecedently to any Regard to the Corruption of human Nature:* Now I shall do this with all the Impartiality and Exactness I am able, and therefore shall not scruple to use their very Words, whenever I cannot fully express their Sense more clearly, or more briefly, in Words of mine own.

I say the principal Arguments and Objections, because I don't intend to collect all that has been urged on one Side or the other upon this Subject; but only to shew where the chief Strength of each Party lies. And therefore we may dismiss,

1. *On the Side of the Calvinists.*

1. *The Argument from the Visitation of the Iniquities of the Fathers upon the Children, of the Prince upon the*

† Vid. *Turr. P.* 677

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 9

People, &c. Because the Disparity in the Cases is too great for any solid Argument to be drawn from one to the other : The visiting the Iniquities of the Fathers upon the Children, or of the Prince upon the People, is only by inflicting *temporal Punishments* upon them. It is not pretended that any Man is punished *in the World to come*, for the Sins of his Father or his Prince : And *in this World*, no Man who knows the Difference between moral Good and Evil, suffers more, or indeed so much, as his own Iniquities deserve. Now certainly God may take what Occasion he pleases to punish any Man less than his own Sins deserve, without the least Suspicion of Injustice or Severity. But this won't at all vindicate the divine Justice in punishing those eternally, who have never sinned in their own Persons, such as Infants, Ideots, &c.

2: *We may likewise dismiss the Argument from the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ to Believers, considering it simply in it self.* For we easily enough conceive, how God, in the Riches of his Grace, may transfer Merit and Blessings from one Person to many ; this being a Dispensation of Mercy, where all is free, and such a Method is taken as may best declare the Goodness of God. But in the Imputation of Sin and Guilt, which are Matters of strict Justice, it is quite otherwise. Grace may give that to a Man, which is not his due ; but Justice cannot : for Grace bestows a Blessing on the Undeserving ; but Justice exacts Punishment only of him who deserves it.]

I observe these Things of this Argument, only thus *simply consider'd* : For if we view it in another Light, viz. by the Opposition in which the Sin of *Adam*, and the Effects of it, are set in Scripture

10 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

ture to the Effects and Benefits of *Christ's* Death; particularly in our Justification thro' him, in which there is an Imputation of the Merits and Effects of his Death, which are thereby transferred to us; in this Light (I say) it will deserve a great Attention, which shall accordingly be given to it hereafter.

To conclude,

3. *We may also dismiss the Illustration of this Doctrine (for I think it is hardly pretended to be an Argument) taken from Levi's being said to have payed Tithes in Abraham, for that he was yet in the Loyns of his Father when Melchisedec met him. †*

For,

1. * *The Apostle introduces the Passage referr'd to as a more harsh Illustration, with the softning Form of Speech, as I may so say.*

And,

2. *This Argument, if it may be consider'd as one, proves too much. For it will unavoidably follow from it, so far as it hath any reasonable Foundation, not only that the first Sin of Adam, but all his other Sins, with all those of our Progenitors, in a successive Order from him, ought to be charged upon us: For we were in the Loyns of them all.*

Again,

2. *On the Arminian Side, we may fairly dismiss all those Arguments by which the learned Dr. Whitby and others labour to prove, that Adam's first Sin was not every Man's personal Sin, and was not consented to by every Man's personal Will, &c For in these Arguments they fight with a Man of Straw, indeed I believe not of their own making, but besure not set up by the later Calvinists, and which, I think, they*

† Heb. 7. 9, 10.

* Dr. Fiddes Vol. I. P. 392.

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 11

won't at all envy them the Pleasure and Triumph of knocking down. For the Principle against which the Arguments of this sort are levell'd, is expressly disclaimed by the more eminent *Calvinists* of later Times, and some of them I suppose much older than the learned Doctor. I shall mention but two or three, *viz.*

1. *Turrettine* †, who says, "*Imputatio vel est Rei aliena, vel propriae. Aliquando imputatur nobis, &c. Hic vero agitur de ista Imputatione non de illa, quia agitur de Peccato ab Adamo commisso, non a Nobis.*"

2. *Van Mastricht* ‖, whose Words are, "*Imputatio non consistit in mera Putatione, qua Deus putet Fædusfragium Protoplastorum, non ab ipsis tantum perpetratum fuisse, sed actualiter et personaliter etiam ab omnibus eorum Posteris: esset enim in hoc Error manifestus.*"

I shall only add one Passage more,

3. From our late Rev. and learned Mr. *President Willard* * who says, "That the Posterity of Adam have not committed his Sin in their own Persons; but only because their Persons were legally in him, as the Person of the Debtor is in the Surety, hence it is all put down upon their Accounts as legally as it is upon Adam's."

From these Passages of three such zealous Assertors of the Imputation of Adam's Sin, I think it plain, that such sort of Arguments as these above-mentioned, confute nothing, but what the *Calvinists* (of later Times at least) deny, as well as their Adversaries.

† Vol. I. P. 678. ‖ Vol. I. P. 344. * Loc. Sup. Cit.

12 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

But 'tis time to pass on to Things of more Importance on both Sides of the Question. And here,

I. The *Calvinists* who affirm the Imputation of *Adam's* first Sin to all his Posterity by ordinary Generation, antecedently to any Regard to the Corruption of human Nature, lay the Foundation of this Doctrine in the Covenant of Nature, or Works, between God and *Adam*. For they maintain

1. That when God had created *Adam*, he entred into a Covenant of Life with him, upon Condition of perfect Obedience forbidding him to eat of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil upon Pain of Death.

2. That the Life promised, and the Death threatned in this Covenant, was not only natural, but spiritual and eternal. And

3. That this Covenant was made with *Adam*, not only for himself, but for all his Posterity by ordinary Generation.

I. They maintain, That when God had created *Adam*, he entred into a Covenant of Life with him, upon Condition of perfect Obedience, forbidding him to eat of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, upon Pain of Death. The Continuance of Life upon Condition of perfect Obedience, (say they) was implicitly promised in the threatening of Death only in case of Disobedience. For to threaten Man with that in case of Disobedience, which must have befallen him whether he disobey'd or no, seems utterly irreconcilable, either with the Wisdom or with the Sincerity of his Sovereign: I might add, with his Goodness and his Justice too; for a threatening of Death only in case of Disobedience, must naturally lead Man to expect Life, so long as he persevered

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 13

persevered in his Duty. And this wou'd have been to encourage him to Obedience, with the reasonable Expectation of a Benefit, which yet God never intended he should reap by it ; if notwithstanding a Perseverance in perfect Obedience, Death must at length have seized upon him.

The same Thing may be further argued from these Passages of Scripture which represent Sin, as what introduced Death into the World. *By one Man Sin entred into the World, and Death by Sin*, says the Apostle, Rom. v. 12. And lest any should surmise, that Death is said to have *entred into the World by Sin*, only because that by means of *that*, it made an earlier Entrance than otherwise it would have done ; and not because it wou'd not have entred at all, if Man had not sinned ; we therefore read in the next Chapter, Ver. 23. *That the Wages of Sin is Death, but the Gift of God is eternal Life, thro' Jesus Christ our Lord*. Upon which it is natural to observe, that we might as reasonably think, that Man now in his lapsed State might obtain *eternal Life without the Gift of God thro' Jesus Christ our Lord* ; as that *Adam*, had he continued in a State of perfect Obedience, should have suffered *Death, the Wages of Sin*. If *Death* not only *entred into the World by Sin*, but was the proper *Wages of it*, we may assure ourselves it wou'd never have entred at all, if Man had not sinned. For we cannot suppose, that either the Justice or the Goodness of God, wou'd suffer the righteous to receive the Wages of the wicked. And if *Death* cou'd never have entred into the World, if Man had never sinned, then *Life* must have been his Portion, had he continued perfectly obedient. And if so, we may very well conclude, that when *Death* was threatned in case of Disobedience, it implied a Promise of *Life upon Condition of perfect Obedience*. And for

14 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

for the Confirmation of this Promise, there was *the Tree of Life in the midst of the Garden*, of which *Adam* before he sinned, might have eaten if he pleased, and lived forever, or had immortal Life secured to him.

2. They maintain, *That the Life promised, and the Death threatned in this Covenant, were not only natural, but spiritual and eternal.* And here,

1. That *the Death threatned was not only natural, but spiritual and eternal*, they say, is evident, because the Loss of original Righteousness, and the Corruption of Nature consequent upon it, is call'd in Scripture, *Death in Trespasses and Sins* (a); and because *this spiritual Death* is the Consequence of the first Transgression of our grand Parents, as appears from what the Apostle tells us, Rom. v. 19. *That by one Man's Disobedience many were made Sinners.*

And if *spiritual Death* was included in the Threatning, they argue that *eternal Death* must be so too; because everlasting Misery, in a greater or less Degree, to a Creature made for everlasting Duration, is a necessary Consequence of its Loss of the Image and Favour of God; unless prevented by the Restoration of them, or suspended to make Way for it.

And to this they add, That the Scriptures tell us, that *the Wages of Sin is Death*, in Opposition to *that eternal Life, which is the Gift of God*, Rom. vi. 23. Now this intimates, that *such a Death* as is commensurate in Duration to *eternal Life*, is as properly *the Wages of Sin*, as *eternal Life* is *the Gift of God*. For tho' the Addition of the Word *eternal*, makes the

(a) Eph. 2. 1.

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 15

signification of the one more express than of the other, yet where they are both mentioned without that Addition, no doubt is to be made, but that they are so to be understood: As when it is said, (*b*) *That to be carnally minded is Death, but to be spiritually minded is Life and Peace*; and (*c*) *believing we have Life thro' his Name*; and (*d*) *ye will not come unto me, that ye may have Life*. Now if Death in this Sense is the proper Wages of Sin, no doubt can be made but that this sort of Death was included in the Threatning.

2. If the Death threatned to Adam in case of Disobedience included in it, not only *natural Death* or the separation of Soul and Body; but *spiritual Death* or the Loss of original Righteousness, and the Corruption of Nature consequent upon it; and *eternal Death* or Misery: Then, say they, we must suppose, that not only the Continuance of Man's natural Life; but also of his moral Rectitude; of his Interest in and Sense of the divine Favour; and eternal Happiness; were all implicitly promised to him, upon Condition of perfect Obedience. For the Continuance of all that Life was implicitly promis'd upon Condition of perfect Obedience, which was opposite to the Death threatned in case of Disobedience. Now these are the Things contrary to the Evils included in the threatning of Death; and these are the Things, which, upon his sinning against God, Adam was actually deprived of, in Fulfillment of that Threatning.

(*b*) Rom. 8, 6. (*c*) John 20. 31. (*d*) John 5. 40.

16 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

3. The Calvinists maintain, *That this Covenant was made with Adam, not only for himself, but for all his Posterity by ordinary Generation* : That as he was to be the common Parent of Mankind, so he was constituted by God their Representative also : And that the Covenant was made with him, so that if he had obeyed, all his Posterity should have been happy thro' his Obedience ; but by his Disobedience they were all to be esteemed to have sinned in him, his Act being imputed and transferred to them all.

Now that this is true, that *Adam* was set in such a publick Capacity to be the Representative of his Posterity, and act for them, they think to be manifest both from the Scriptures, and also from Fact & Experience.

1. *The Scriptures teach this* * where the Apostle compares *Adam* with *Christ*, and makes the Parallel between them, *Rom. 5.* from Ver. 12 to 20. For as *Christ* was a publick Person, so was *Adam* ; who therefore is called the first Man, as *Christ* is the second Man, *1 Cor. 15. 47.* As if there was but these two Men in the World. The Reason is, because these were the Heads and Representatives of all Persons in the World ; these comprehended and included all Men in them.

So when it is said, *That in Adam all have sinned*, *Rom. 5. 12* ; it must be understood of him, as he was the common Head and Representative of all the Sons of Men : or else it might as well have been said, *In our immediate Parents we all sinned* ; but no Man asserts this, and for this Reason, because our immediate Parents were not publick Persons, and

* *Edwards's Ver. Red. P. 292, 293.*

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 17

did not represent us, and much less all Mankind, which is the Foundation of the transferring of *Adam's Sin* to all his Posterity. If this Depravity were the Effect of natural Descent only, then we might be said to have sinned in our *Father and Mother*, rather than in *Adam and Eve*. This plainly shews that *Adam* was a Person that represented his whole Race, and consequently what he did is reckoned as done by them: The Sin which he committed is *legally* reputed to be committed by us all. For what a publick Deputy or Representative doth, he doth not for himself only, but for others. Thus it appears *from the Scriptures*, that *Adam* was set in a publick Capacity to be the Representative of his Posterity, and act for them. And the same Thing the *Calvinists* think to be also manifest,

2. *From Fact and Experience.* Inasmuch as we find natural and spiritual Death by the Sin of *Adam* bro't upon us all. And from spiritual Death follows an Incapacity for eternal Life, and a Liableness to eternal Misery, which must at length ensue, unless God in Mercy prevent. And thus I have represented the Reasoning of the *Calvinists* upon this Head, from the Covenant of Nature or Works, with as much Perspicuity as I cou'd, without drawing the Argument to a greater length. I must proceed now to take a View of what is objected to all this from the other Side. But first I shall premise, that to the whole Doctrine of the Imputation of *Adam's first Sin* to his Posterity, the *Arminians* object,

* That it is no small Prejudice against this Opinion, that it was so long before it appeared first in the

* Bishop *Burnet's* Exposi. of the 39 Arti. P. 119.

18 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

Latin Church, that it was never received in the Greek ; and that even the Latin Church, tho' perhaps for some ignorant Ages it received it, as it did every Thing else very implicitly ; yet hath been very much divided both about this, and many other Opinions related to it, or arising out of it.

Answ. But this Objection is grounded upon a Supposition, which their Adversaries by no Means admit. Some of them affirm, † That the Catholick Church was always of their Opinion ; and endeavour to prove it by Testimonies from Ignatius to Austin.

The *Arminians* again say, That all the Passages they alledge, are impertinent, or at least, insufficient to prove the Point. And so it happens in this Case, as I think it does in all other disputed Matters of *Doctrine*, that instead of being clear'd, they are rather more perplex'd, by being referr'd to the Decision of Ecclesiastical Antiquity. The Reason of which is, that in *doctrinal* Matters of Dispute, the Fathers of the earlier Centuries, before those Things began to be controverted in the Christian Church, seldom ever speak more determinately, and for the most part not so determinately, as the Scriptures do about them. And the Fathers of the following Centuries are of too little Authority, to have their Opinions depended on in Matters of Dispute ; any farther than they support them with sufficient Reasons. And from hence it comes to pass, that by leaving the Scriptures, and appealing to Ecclesiastical Antiquity, for the Determination of such Points in Controversy, a few learned Men are left at Liberty to contradict one another as they please ; and all

† *Vossius*, as cited by *Whitby*, Pref. P. 4.

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 19

the World beside, who want Learning, Leisure, or Librarys sufficient, must contentedly remain ignorant, which Party speaks the Truth, and which denies it.

Upon the whole, without being careful to examine into the Sense of Antiquity with respect to the present Point, I am prone to think, that what Calvin observes concerning the Doctrine of hereditary Corruption, is equally applicable to the Case before us; *Quod vetustissimi Ecclesiæ Doctores obscure tantum perstrinxerunt hoc caput; saltem minus dilucide quam par erat explicaverunt* †: That the most ancient Doctors of the Church did but obscurely glance at this Head; at least that they explain'd it less clearly than was meet. For it is very reasonable to suppose, that the Questions concerning the Imputation and Propagation of original Sin, were not very accurately treated of by ecclesiastical Writers, before Pelagius gave Occasion to examine those Matters carefully, by affirming, that the Sin of Adam was meerly personal, and hurt no Body but himself.

Having premised these Things, I now proceed to the Objections levell'd more directly against the several Positions of the Calvinistical Argument from the Covenant of Nature between God and Adam, which we have been taking a View of. And here against the Truth of the first Position more especially, which is,

That when God had created Adam, he entred into a Covenant of Life with him, upon Condition of perfect Obedience, forbidding him to eat of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil upon Pain of Death. The Arminians and others object,

† Institut. P. 135.

20 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

Object. * That it seems very strange, that a Thing of so great Consequence, as this supposed Covenant with *Adam*, as the Representative Head of Mankind, shou'd not be more plainly reported in the History of the Creation ; but that Men should be put to fetch out the Knowledge of so great, and so extraordinary a Thing, only by some remote Consequences.

The *Calvinists* reply,

Ans. 1. That the Remoteness of a Consequence don't prove it not to be genuine. However they think the Consequences by which they deduce this Matter to be obvious and immediate, and to form a Chain which cannot be broken. And

2 As for the sacred Historian's not speaking plainer about a Matter of such Importance : this, they say, is not at all more strange, than that he hath not spoken plainer about the Agency of the Devil in the Seduction of our first Parents ; or about the Redemption of Mankind by Christ in the obscure Promise of the Seed of the Woman.

I shall only add upon this Head, *That the Dispute ought to be about Things, and not about Words.* And therefore, if it be certain, that God threatned *Adam* with Death in case of Disobedience ; and if it be certain, that a Threatning of Death from God only in case of Disobedience, implied in it a Promise of Life upon Condition of perfect Obedience ; for the Confirmation of which implicit Promise, there was *the Tree of Life in the midst of the Garden*, of which *Adam*, before his Sin, might have eaten, if he had

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 21

pleased, and *liv'd forever*, or had immortal Life ensured to him : I say, if these Things are certain, it is of no Importance to the Dispute before us, whether such a Transaction can properly be call'd a *Covenant*, or no. It will be enough, notwithstanding what is, or can be objected against the Name, that God promised Continuance of Life to Adam upon Condition of Obedience, and threatned him with Death in case of Disobedience. I pass now to the Objections against the second Position of the *Calvinists*, which is,

Positi. 2. *That the Life promised and the Death threatned to Adam, was not only natural, but spiritual and eternal.* Now this their Adversaries utterly deny, and object,

* *That as it cannot be proved from Scripture, so it doth manifestly contradict the express Words of God ; In the Day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die ||.* For that Phrase, say they, frequently occurs in the Law of *Moses*, and always signifies *Death temporal*.

Moreover, God gives this Reason of that Threat, *For Dust thou art, and unto Dust shalt thou return†*, which cannot in the least relate unto the Soul. From whence they conclude, That that Sentence imports the *Condemnation* (they should say, if they would conclude to the Purpose, That that Threatning imports the Death) not of the Soul, but of the Body only. To which the *Calvinists* reply,

Ans. 1. *That that Sentence, Dust thou art, and unto Dust shalt thou return, is not given by God as a Reason of that Threatning, In the Day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die.* There is not the least Ground

* *Whitby's Pref. P. 12.* || *Gen. 2. 17.* † *Gen. 3. 19.*

22 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

for this Pretence ; as any Man may see, who will be at the Pains of opening his Bible. The Truth of the Case is only, That that Sentence, *Dust thou art, and unto Dust shalt thou return*, is pronounced upon Adam as one Part of the Punishment due to him for eating the forbidden Fruit, and therefore must be Part, and can be no more than a Part of what was included in the Threatning, That *in the Day that he eat thereof, dying he should die*. And therefore, though the Calvinists readily allow, that that Sentence, *Dust thou art, and unto Dust shalt thou return*, imports the Condemnation, not of the Soul, but of the Body only ; yet it won't from hence follow, that the Threatning, *In the Day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die*, did not include spiritual & eternal, as well as temporal Death, but rather the contrary ; because the Sentence, *Unto Dust shalt thou return*, manifestly intends but a Part of the Punishment included in the Threatning, *Dying thou shalt die*.

For

Ans. 2. *All that Death must be included in the Threatning, from which Adam was redeemed by the promised Seed of the Woman ; otherwise it would follow, that Part of the Danger, and that infinitely the greatest Part too, to which Adam wou'd expose himself by sinning against God, was concealed from him ; which would be irreconcilable, either with the Wisdom or Goodness of God : I might fairly add, with his Justice also. Now if Adam was rescued from spiritual and eternal Death, after he had sinned against God, it must be by the promised Seed of the Woman. For there neither is, nor ever was Salvation to apostate Man in any other, and therefore spiritual and eternal, as well as temporal Death, must have been included in the Threatning. And from hence we may argue,*

Ans

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 23

Ans^w. 3. *That tho' it may be true, that the Phrase Dying thou shalt die, in the Law of Moses, ordinarily imports nothing more than temporal Death, yet it won't from hence follow, that it never does; and particularly that it does not in the Threatning denounced against Adam, In the Day that thou eatest thereof, &c. For we who have the Comment of the New-Testament to guide us in Understanding the Old, ought to be determin'd by it: And therefore, when we read Rom. 6. 23. That the Wages of Sin is Death, but the Gift of God is eternal Life, thro' Jesus Christ our Lord, we must understand, that such a Death or Misery as is commensurate in Duration to eternal Life, is as properly the Wages of Sin, as eternal Life is the Gift of God. Now if Death in this Sense, is the proper Wages of Sin, no doubt can be made, but that this Sort of Death was included in the Threatning. And if spiritual and eternal Death were included in the Threatning in case of Disobedience, then we must suppose, that the Continuance of spiritual even to eternal (as well as of natural) Life, was implicitly promised to Adam, upon Condition of perfect Obedience. For the Continuance of all that Life was implicitly promised upon Condition of perfect Obedience, which was opposite to the Death threatned in case of Disobedience. But the greatest Contest of all is, concerning the third Position of the Calvinists, viz.*

Positi. 3. *That this Covenant, or this Promise of Life and Threatning of Death, was made to Adam, not only for himself, but for all his Posterity by ordinary Generation. To which the Arminians and others object,*

Object. † *That the Calvinists have forged this Covenant between God and Adam out of their own Brain to*

† Dr. *Whisby*, P. 83.

justify

24 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

justify this Imputation of his Sin to his Posterity. The Calvinists reply for themselves,

Ans^r: That it is a vain Thing to object against Fact. That we all find by Experience, that all the Penalties to which Adam was doomed for his Sin, are come upon all his Posterity. They all eat Bread in Sorrow, and the Sweat of their Face, and at length return to the Dust as well as he. And if he was redeemed from eternal Death or Misery by the promised Seed of the Woman, so are they also, as many of them as escape it; which supposes that they were
his *all rendered obnoxious to it by Sin.*

Object. 2. It is objected, || That God is as much obliged, by the Rectitude of his Nature, to deal equally in charging the Guilt of Adam's first Sin upon no other than him that actually committed it, and those that were some way or other accessory to that Crime, as he is obliged to deal so with all other Sins and Sinners. And if we consider Adam as a Head and Representative to his Posterity, it makes no Alteration in the Case, because it was not his Posterity, but Almighty God, which constituted that Relation; and therefore his Posterity ought not, in Justice, to be Sufferers by it. If the Body of Mankind had chosen Adam to be their Head, and had given him Power and Authority to act in their Stead, and had undertook to be accountable for all he did, then indeed they had been justly chargable with his Fault; but when he is made their Head by another, without their Consent, and acts without their Appointment, his Fault cannot with any Colour of Justice and Equity, be charged upon them. How unequal must it be for us to

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 25

be chargeable with that Guilt, which was contracted five thousand Years before we were born? To this the *Calvinists* reply,

Ans. 1. That the Objection it self supposes, that the Guilt of *Adam's* first Sin may, *with Equity*, be charged upon all those, *who are some way or other accessory to that Crime*; and that the Author of the Objection maintains ||, That when any Person, by advising, approving of, consenting to, or not using his Endeavour to prevent the Sin committed by another; or any other Way makes himself an *Accessory* to another's Crime, either before or after the Fact; such a Person may, in some Sense, be said to be guilty of the Sin which is committed in and by the Person of another, because he becomes a *Partner* with the Criminal in his Folly. Now (say the *Calvinists* *) the Sin of *Adam* is imputed to us, (partly at least) because we consent to his Disobedience, we approve of his Folly. Every Man naturally does this, and therefore he is chargeable with his Crime. This is manifest from what we read, *Rev. 18. 24.* where it is said of *Babylon*, (that mystical *Babylon* which is *Rome*) that *in her was found the Blood of the Prophets, and of Saints, & of all that were slain upon the Earth.* But how was it possible to find all this Blood, that is, the Guilt of it in this one Place? The answer is, Those who are extremely bloody and barbarous, have all inhumane Actions put upon their Account, though they are not actually guilty of them, because their Approbation of all Blood and Murder renders them guilty of all. The like is to be said in the present Case, by approving of *Adam's* Trespas, we are interpreted to have the Guilt of it upon us. We all

|| Mr. Chubb, P. 93. * Vid. Dr. Edwards's Ver. Red. P. 296.
E of

26 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

of us by Nature allow of his Delinquency, we are inwardly pleased with such Disobedience, and so by our *after Consent* we make it our own.

Nay, we not only approve of, and consent to, but actually commit the like Sins that our first Progenitors committed, and thereby we tell the World that we justify their Rebellion, and on that Account may justly be said to be guilty of the same Offence with them. We daily question God's Truth and Word, we disbelieve what he saith, we yield to Satan's Temptations, we are mastered by our sensual Appetites, we act contrary to what God commands or forbids. Thus we actually run into those particular Disorders which *Adam* and *Eve* were carried away with at their Fall. Their Sin is acted over again by Mankind, which may convince us how reasonable it is that the Guilt of it should be transferred to us.

This may be further argued from what our Saviour told the *Lawyers*, Luke 11. 50, 51. That *the Blood of all the Prophets, which was shed from the Foundation of the World, from the Blood of Abel, unto the Blood of Zecharias, should be required of them.* But how was all this Blood charged upon these Men, who lived in our Saviour's Time? The Answer is obvious, they were inwardly disposed to all Cruelty & Violence, and besides that, they actually persecuted and slew the Saints of God that were among them, and they sought the Blood of the innocent Lamb of God, and did not rest till they saw the Effusion of it on the Cross. This made them guilty before God of all the Blood shed from *Abel* to *Zecharias*; for by practising the like, they are reckoned to have done all that. With as good Reason then may we all be charged with *Adam's Sin*, as those *Jews* were charged

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 27

ed with all the Blood shed from *Abel* to *Zecharias*. We tread in the Steps of our first Parents, we sin as they did, and in the very same Instances, and therefore it is not unjust with God to impute their Sin to us. Tho' we did not in Person act it, yet we have since by our daily Perpetrations of the same kind, approved of what they did, and we repeat the same Sort of Transgression thro' our whole Lives. This *practical Approbation*, and *after Consent* to the Sin of our first Parents, renders the Imputation of their Fault accountable and reasonable with respect to all such as live to Years of Discretion, to distinguish between moral Good and Evil, so far as they are made liable to *positive Punishment* hereby. Again, it is further answered,

Ans. 2. *That our not actually consenting to the Covenant which God made with Adam, is no Evidence that we are not obliged by it **. This we learn from what is recorded in Gen. 17. 2. &c. where 'tis said, that God made a Covenant between Him & Abraham and his Seed, and Circumcision was the Seal of it; and every Child that was uncircumcised, is said to *break this Covenant*, ver. 14. which he cou'd not be said to do, unless he was obliged by it. Whence we rationally infer, that actual Consent (for such cannot be in Children and Infants) is not necessary to this Obligation. For absent Persons, yea such who are not born, may be Parties in a Covenant with God, as is clear from Deut. 29. 14, 15. where is mention of a solemn Agreement made between God and the People of *Israel*, and it is said, *Neither with you only do I make this Covenant and this Oath, but with him that standeth here with us this Day before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this Day ; that is, no*

only with those who were in some other Place at that Time, but all the People that were to succeed afterwards. The Covenant was made with the *Israelites* and their Posterity. And as for Covenants made between Man and Man at this Day, it is well known they include those Persons that are not in Being; and particularly Parents, when they make Contracts with others, oblige their Children and Heirs, even sometimes before they are born, to keep the Conditions of these Contracts. It was not therefore unjust that a Covenant should be enter'd into by our first Parents for themselves, and for their succeeding Race, even all those that were not in Being at that Time. And thus 'tis plain, that *Adam's Sin* is become ours, because he contracted with God for us, as well as for himself. This fairly accounts for our Loss of eternal Life and Happiness by the Sin of *Adam*, because the Promise of these was an Act of God's free Bounty. † For no Man can pretend, that an innocent Creature which preserves its Integrity, must for that Reason be advanced to the unspeakable everlasting Joys of Heaven. No Creature can be profitable to his Maker, and an unprofitable Servant can merit no such Reward. And what God was not obliged (otherwise than by Promise) to bestow, tho' Man had continued in the State of Innocency, he might, with all the Justice and Reason in the World, refuse, when Men became divested of their Innocency, and thereby forfeited all Pretences to that Happiness (and lost their Capacity for it) which was promised upon Condition that our first Parents had continued in their primitive and original State of Righteousness. * This Method of divine Providence is highly agreeable to the ordinary

† Vid. Mr. *Jenkin*, Vol. II. P. 243. * Dr. *Fiddes* Vol. I. P. 301.
Proceedings

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 29

Proceedings of the civil Magistrate in this World; where it is tho't no Injustice to exclude Children, on occasion of certain Crimes or Forfeitures in their Parents, from those legal Rights, which otherwise would have descended to them by Inheritance.

Ans. 3. The Objection before us allows, that if the Body of Mankind had chosen *Adam* to be their Representative, and had given him Power and Authority to act in their Stead, and had undertook to be accountable for all he did, then they had been justly chargable with his Fault. Now, say the Calvinists, *his being appointed by God, and not by the Body of Mankind, to represent them, makes no Alteration in the Case; because this Appointment was evidently in its own Nature for the Good and Advantage of Mankind, and was what they themselves would have consented to or chosen, could it have antecedently been proposed to them; as will be fully made to appear by the Answers to the next Objection, which is,*

Object. 3. † That this pretended Covenant is impossible, because it would have been exceeding cruel, and plainly inconsistent with the Justice, Wisdom and Goodness of our gracious God. For surely a good God in all his Covenants with the Sons of Men designs their Good, or their Advantage; for so it is in all the other Covenants God ever made with Men; but God could not design the Good of Men by this Covenant, upon the foreseen Event. For did not God know before this Compact, that it would only tend by the Fall of Adam to the unavoidable Ruin of Myriads of Souls, which otherwise would have contracted no such Guilt, and therefore would have been ob-

† Dr. *Whitby*, P. 84, 85.

30 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

noxious to no such Misery, had not this Covenant been made? How therefore could he contrive and make such a Covenant, without being willing that so many Men and Infants should be forever miserable by it, since he who wills the Cause, wills also the Effect, which certainly and inevitably, without their Action, follows from it. To this the *Calvinists* reply,

Ans. That the Objection is rather calculated to rouse the Passions, than to convince the Understanding of any Man, who weighs the Matter impartially: That the seeming Difficulties urged in it will disappear entirely, upon the Supposition of two demonstrable Truths, viz.

1. *That such a Covenant was in its own Nature equitable, and even for the Good and Advantage of Mankind, considering it abstractedly from a Foresight of the Event.*
And

2. *That if it was in its own Nature equitable, and for the Good and Advantage of Mankind, then a Foresight of the Event could be no just Reason why God should not establish it.* For if these two Things are well proved, the Establishment of such a Covenant will appear to have been to the Honour of the divine Perfections, and not to minister any reasonable Objection against them. They maintain then

1. *That such a Covenant was in its own Nature equitable, and even for the Good and Advantage of Mankind, considering it abstractedly from a Foresight of the Event.* The Equity and Goodness of it, so far as Adam alone was concerned in it, is not nor can be disputed by those who understand it right. For, as a Reward of perfect Obedience, here was promised eternal Life and Happiness; as great a Good, as eternal
Death

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 31

Death or Misery, which was threatned in case of Disobedience, is an Evil. All the Doubt therefore can only be, whether it was equitable that *Adam* should be appointed by God to act in this Case for his Posterity, as well as for himself, so that they should all share with him in Life and Happiness upon Condition of his perfect Obedience; or become obnoxious with him to Death & Misery in case of his Disobedience. And here the *Calvinists* say,

That the divine Appointment, considering it abstractedly from a Foresight of the Event, was in its own Nature, not only equitable, but for the Good and Advantage of Mankind, and what it may reasonably be supposed they would all have consented to & chosen, could it antecedently have been proposed to them; because they would have thought themselves more likely to escape the Punishment threatned, and to obtain the promised Blessing, if their Interests were deposited with their common Parent, than if they had been appointed to Act, each Man for himself.

For

1. *Adam was the immediate Workmanship of God, and therefore could not but be under stronger and more affecting Impressions of his Obligations and Duty to him, than Persons who came into the World in the Way of ordinary Generation.*

2. *Adam receiv'd the Covenant, not remotely by Tradition from others, but immediately from the Mouth of God himself, which must also naturally tend to render it more impressive.*

And

3. *The Welfare of all his Posterity, as well as his own, depended upon his Demeanour in one easy Point. Now we often see, that Men, out of Love and Concern for their Posterity, refrain from those Crimes, from which*

32 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

which no Consideration of themselves could have withheld them. The Experience of the World hath found this to be the most effectual Remedy with many Men ; and therefore the wisest and justest Governments have made Use of it : And why then might not the most wise and just God think fit to deal in this Manner with our first Parent, by representing to him, that the Happiness or Misery of his Posterity, depended upon his good or ill Behaviour in this one Instance of his Duty.

Now (say the *Calvinists*) either of these Considerations singly, and much more all of them laid together, rendered it a Thing much more likely, that *Adam* should continue stedfast in his Obedience during his Time of Probation, than that any Man of his Posterity would, if exposed to the same or equal Temptations, and left to the same Freedom of Will, and not more powerfully assisted than he was by the preventing Grace of God. And if *Adam*, being under stronger Inducements thereto than any of his Posterity ever could have been, was to all Appearance, much more likely than they, to have continued stedfast in his Obedience ; it will thence follow, that his being appointed by God to represent them, and act for them, was not only equitable, but in the Nature of the Thing, tended more to the Good and Advantage of Mankind, than if every Man had been appointed to act for himself : and therefore it may reasonably be supposed, that every Child of *Adam*, could it have been antecedently proposed to him, would have consented to it, and even chosen, that this Covenant should be made with *Adam*, not only for himself, but for his Posterity also. And from hence it will follow,

2. That

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 33

2. That a Foresight of the Event, could be no just Reason, why God should not establish the Covenant with Adam in this manner. For,

1. Who ever tho't it a good Reason against taking the most likely and suitable Method to prevent a Mischief, that after all the Mischief will happen notwithstanding; if other valuable Ends may be answered by taking such a Method, tho' the Mischief be not prevented by it? When God did that, which was in its self most likely to prevent the Apostacy and Ruin of Mankind, he did that which it was most consistent with his own Perfections for him to do, let the foreseen Event be what it would.

2. No Man can tell what God foresaw the Event would be, if he had appointed Men, as he did the Angels, to stand or fall every one by himself. It is most probable that this would have been far from making the Case better. For since none of them could have had such affecting Inducements, as their grand Progenitor had, to take heed to themselves; it is most likely that They, would more readily than He, have let go their Integrity; unless more of the preventing Grace of God had been vouchsafed to them, than was vouchsafed to him, or than would have been proper to be afforded to them in such probationary Circumstances.

I pass now to observe, that the *Arminians* object,

Object. 4. * That as for the other Part of this Compact, viz. that Adam continuing Innocent, should have begotten Children in his own Likeness, that is, Partakers of his own original Righteousness.

• Dr. *Whitby*, p. 84.

34 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

1. *This could produce no proportionable Advantage to his Posterity* For his Righteousness being defectible, he could only have deriv'd upon them a defectible Righteousness, which must have left them still as liable to fall, as he himself was ; and then their Posterity must have been in the same sad Case, in which *Adam's* Fall, had placed his Posterity.

And,

2. *His Sin, had he fallen after he had begotten Children, must have involved all the rest in this sad Doom.* So that his whole righteous Life could have only procured to his Posterity a defectible Righteousness, liable continually to Interruption by the Sin of any one of his Posterity ; and that throughout all Times and Ages of the World. Whereas one single Transgression of his, was by this Compact, to render his whole Race obnoxious to eternal Misery. To this the *Calvinists* reply,

Answ. That the Objection is entirely founded upon false Suppositions which they utterly disallow. Indeed they readily admit, that the Righteousness of *Adam* being defectible, he could naturally have transmitted nothing more than a defectible Righteousness to his Posterity. Nor is it possible (say they) that the Righteousness of any meer Creature should be in its own Nature indefectible. The highest Angel in Heaven hath no Security that he shall never fall ; unless he hath the Goodness and Truth, and Power of God engaged for his Preservation. For nothing short of absolute Perfection, can in its own Nature, necessarily imply Indefectibility in the Possessor of it.

But all this don't hinder, but that the Righteousness of a Creature, which in its own Nature is not, and cannot be, other than defectible, may nevertheless

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 35

theless be preserved from Failure, by the Goodness and Power of God: Wherever the Truth of God stands engaged for it, we may rest assured, that it not only may, but certainly will, be so preserved. Thus the elect Angels are forever confirmed in Holiness and Happiness; tho' naturally as liable to sin against God, as those were at first, who left their own Habitation; and are now reserved in everlasting Chains. And so those among the apostate Sons of Adam, whom God hath chosen in Christ before the Foundation of the World, shall never be suffered finally to fall away; but notwithstanding their many Infirmities, shall be kept by the Power of God thro' Faith unto Salvation. And by the same Power of God (say the Calvinists) in virtue of his covenant Promise, should all the Posterity of Adam have been kept forever holy and happy (notwithstanding the natural Defectibility of the Righteousness he transmitted to them) if he himself had continued Perfect in his Obedience. Upon the whole, it is manifest, that this Objection takes two things for granted by the Calvinists, both of which they utterly deny. viz.

1. *That the promissory Part of the Covenant with Adam, was only that he continuing Innocent, should beget Children in his own Likeness.*

And therefore,

2. *That his Righteousness being defectible, he could have transmitted only such a Righteousness to his Posterity as would have left them as liable to Sin, as he himself was.* Whereas the Calvinists maintain,

1. *That the Covenant of God with Adam, contained an implicit Promise of spiritual and eternal Life to his Posterity, upon Condition of his perfect Obedience.*

F 2

And

36 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

And therefore,

2. *That tho' the Righteousness which Adam would have transmitted to his Posterity, would have been in its own Nature defectible, (as the Righteousness of a Creature cannot but be) yet God would have been in Covenant Faithfulness obliged to confirm them in Holiness and Happiness forever, as he hath done the elect Angels in Heaven, if Adam their Progenitor had held fast his Integrity.* The Reasons of the *Calvinists* for these two Assertions I have mentioned already, and need not repeat them here; but shall only observe,

That if these Assertions of the *Calvinists* are true, then it is plain, that the Advantages promised to the Posterity of *Adam* upon Condition of his Obedience, were proportionable to the Disadvantages threatened in Case of Disobedience. And so there is no just Foundation to object against the Equitableness of this Covenant, upon Account of any Deficiency in the promissory Part of it. I proceed now to another Objection of the *Arminians*, which I think may well enough come in here, *viz.*

Object. 5. * *That we are not guilty of any other Sin of Adam; and therefore we are not guilty of his first Sin.* For Answer to this (say they) the *Calvinists* are driven to confess, that this depends upon the free Constitution of the divine Will. For virtual Inclusion in, or natural Propagation from, the Loins of *Adam*, would not have charged us with the Guilt of any Sin personally committed by *him*, had not God enacted and constituted a Decree that it should be so, when it stood in his Power and Pleasure to have order'd it otherwise. Therefore (say they, according to the *Calvinists*) this Sin of *Adam* is not ours

* Dr. *Whitby*, p. 82, 83.

because

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 37

because he committed it ; but because God of meer Will, decreed and constituted it should be so, *when he might have order'd it otherwise* ; and so there is nothing makes this Sin ours, but the meer Will of God : And surely then God must be the Author of it, because it is the Will of God alone, which makes the first Sin of *Adam* ours, more than the second, of which it is confessed we are not guilty. Nor is there any other Reason why we should be more guilty of it, than of his other Sins, but this Will of God. As then we become Sinners in our own Persons, only by willing that Action which is Evil, should be ours ; so we became Sinners in the Person of *Adam*, only by the Will of God, that his evil Action should be ours ; and had it not been his Pleasure so to Will, it had not been ours.

To make this still more evident (say they) let it be noted, that in every Sin of Commission, there is required not only the Will of the Creator forbidding that Action, but also the Will of the Creature choosing to do what is forbidden : but in this supposed original Sin, there is no Will of ours choosing this forbidden Action more than any other Sin of *Adam* : it was not therefore upon that Account our Sin. It remains then that it was only so by the Will of the Creator. And therefore God (according to the *Calvinists*) must be the Author of Sin. But 'tis time now to hear what the *Calvinists* reply for themselves.

They say then,

Ans. 1. *That the Conclusion of the Arminians by no means follows from their Premises.* For all which this arguing tends to prove is only, that it is owing to the Will of God that the Guilt of *Adam's* sinful Action is imputed to us, and we are bound to sustain the Penalty of it ; and not that God was the Author of the sinful Action, which *Adam* committed.

Ans.

38 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

Answ. 2. That as for our being charged with the Guilt of the first Sin of Adam, and not with the Guilt of the following ones, the Reason of it is very obvious: Because that by one Act of Disobedience Adam broke Covenant with God; and so ceased any longer to stand as a publick Person, and to act for his Posterity as well as for himself.

Answ. 3. That if it be sufficient to make God the Author of Sin, that he decreed and constituted that the Posterity of Adam should suffer for his first Transgression, when he might have ordered the Matter otherwise; and so there was nothing which made that Sin ours but the meer Will of God; then it will be sufficient to make God the Author of Sin, that he hath said, the Soul that sins shall die, whenever the Sin is only the Violation of some positive Law. For every positive Law is a Matter which God might have ordered otherwise if he pleased. And therefore the Arminians might as well say, that God is the Author of every Man's personal Sins against positive Laws, because he imputes those Actions as Sins to them, which would be no Sins, were it not for his meer arbitrary Will so constituting the Matter; as they can say, that God must be the Author of Sin, if he hath imputed the first Sin of Adam to his Posterity, because nothing could make that Sin ours, but the meer Will of God. Whereas every Man sees, that if God hath a Right to enact positive Laws, he must have a Right to treat the Transgressors of those Laws as Sinners, without being chargeable with their Sins: And by parity of Reason, if God had a Right to make a Covenant with Adam, not only for himself, but for his Posterity, he must have a Right to treat his Posterity as Sinners, for his Violation of that Covenant, without being chargeable with the Sin thus imputed to them. Now that God had a Right to make a Covenant
with

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 39

with *Adam*, not only for himself but for his Posterity, provided it was such a Covenant as naturally tended to the Good of his Posterity, the *Calvinists* think no Man can dispute. And that the Covenant which God did make with *Adam*, was such as in its own Nature really tended to the Good of his Posterity, they think they have fully made out by what was offered above. p. 31, 32.

But their Adversaries object, *That the Case of our personal Sins against positive Laws, is not Parallel to that which it is alledged to illustrate, and so the Answer drawn from it is insufficient to remove the Difficulty.* For in every personal Sin of ours against a positive Law, there is not only the Will of God forbidding that Action, which if he pleased he might not forbid, and which if he did not forbid would be no Sin; but there is also our Will chusing to do what is forbidden. Whereas in this supposed original Sin, there is no Will of ours chusing the forbidden Action, more than any other Sin of *Adam*: And therefore upon that Account it was not our Sin; but was only so by the Will of God.

The *Calvinists* reply, That tho' there was no Will of ours chusing *Adam's* eating the forbidden Fruit, more then any other Sin he might afterwards fall into; yet there is what vindicates the Justice of God in imputing the Guilt of that first Sin of *Adam* to us, as much as such a Will in us chusing of it could have done. For the Guilt of this Sin comes to be transferred to us, by Virtue of a Covenant so Equitable and Good, that no doubt can be made, but that if it could have been antecedently proposed to us, we should all have heartily consented to it.

For,

I. We

40 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

1. *We could not but have tho't it reasonable, that God, who promised Life upon Condition of Obedience, should threaten Death in Case of Disobedience.*

2. *We could not but have tho't it more likely (for Reasons before alledged) that we should escape Death, and be confirmed in Life and Happiness, if our Interests were deposited with Adam, and he appointed to represent us, and act for us; than if we had been appointed every one to stand or fall by himself.*

3. *We could not have wished for an easier Trial of Obedience, than that which God was pleased to propound to Adam. Now if the Terms of this Covenant of God with Adam were so equitable and good, that it must reasonably be presumed, that we should have consented to them, if they could have been proposed to us; then the Justice of God can no more be taxed, for dealing with us according to the Tenour of this Covenant, than if we our selves had been present in the Day when it was made, and had actually consented to it.*

But what hath been said may suffice for the Argument of the *Calvinists* for the Imputation of the Guilt of *Adam's* first Sin to his Posterity, from the Covenant of Nature between God and *Adam*; and for a View of the Objections of their Adversaries against this Argument. I have dwelt the longer upon this Head, because it is a matter of the last Importance in the Dispute before us. For on the one Hand, whoever believes that God made no such Covenant with *Adam*, and that such a Covenant would have been inequitable, and therefore must have been impossible; will find himself under a Necessity to put some other Sense upon the most plausible Text of Scripture, that can be alledged to
prove

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 41

prove the Imputation of the Guilt of *Adam's Sin* to his Posterity. And again on the other Hand; he who is once perswaded of the Equitableness and Reality of such a Covenant, will upon that Principle easily (at least to his own Satisfaction) answer all that is ordinarily urged against the Doctrine of the Imputation of the Guilt of *Adam's Sin*, either from Reason or from Scripture.

And now, having represented what the *Calvinists* offer in Proof of the *Reality*, the *Equitableness* and *Goodness* of this Covenant; and what the *Arminians* or *others* object to each of these, with all the Force and Advantage I could give to either Side; it is high time to proceed to another Argument. And I shall mention only one more on the Side of the *Calvinists*; for the Matter is to be determined by Weight, and not by Number.

I don't intend therefore, either to trouble myself, or to exercise your Patience, with collecting all that hath been heaped up on either Side, referring to this Dispute. For while both Parties have been striving to say as many things as they could, it is very observable, that too many of the Arguments urged by some *Calvinists* have little or no Weight in them; and at least as many of the triumphant Objections you will meet with in the Writings of their Adversaries, are entirely founded upon some ignorant, or willful Mistake, of what the *Calvinists* maintain. It will be enough therefore if I only shew, where the chief Strength of each Party lies. And this I think I shall have done on the Side of the *Calvinists*, when I shall have set forth,

Argum. 2. *What they argue from that large Discourse of the Apostle Paul, Rom. 5. wherein he compares the*
G *Blessings*

42 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

Blessings that we receive by the Death of Christ, with the Guilt and Misery which was brought upon us by the Sin of Adam. Now say the Calvinists,

1. *It is confessed, * That by Christ we have both an Imputation or Communication of the Merits of his Death, and likewise a Purity and Holiness of Nature conveyed to us by his Doctrine and Spirit. In Opposition then to this, if the Comparision is to be closely pursued, there must be an Imputation of Sin, as well as a Corruption of Nature transmitted to us, from Adam.*

2. *This is the more considerable as to the Point of Imputation, because the chief Design of the Apostle's Discourse, seems to be levelled at that. For it is begun upon the Head of Reconciliation and Atonement, upon which it follows, || That as by one Man Sin entred into the World, and Death by Sin; and so Death passed upon all Men, for that (or as others render it, in whom) all have sinned. Now they think it is all one to their Point, whether it be rendered for that, or in whom: for tho' the latter Words seem to deliver their Opinion more precisely; yet it being affirmed, according to the other rendering, that all who die have sinned; and it being certain that many Infants die, who have never sinned actually, these must have sinned in Adam, they could Sin no other way.*

3. *It is afterwards said by the Apostle, † That by the Offence of one many are dead: that the Judgment was of one Sin to Condemnation: that by one Mans Offence Death reigned by one: that by one Offence Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation: and that by one Mans Disobedience many were made Sinners. Now as these Words*

** Burnet's Exp. p 114. || Rom. 8. 12. † ver. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. are*

are Positive, and of great Importance in themselves ; so all this is much the stronger, by the Opposition in which every one of them is set, to the Effects and Benefits of Christ's Death ; particularly to our Justification thro' him, in which there is an Imputation of the Merits and Effects of his Death, which are thereby transferred to us ; so that the whole Effect of this Discourse is taken away, if the Imputation of the Guilt of *Adam's Sin* is denied. But I pass now to observe what is objected from the other Side. And here the Adversaries of this Doctrine say,

Object. 1. * *That this Discourse of the Apostle is but a single Proof.* Now when we have not a variety of Places proving any Point, in which one gives Light, and leads us to a sure Exposition of another, we cannot be so certain of the meaning of any one Place, as to raise a Theory, or found a Doctrine upon it. To which the Calvinists reply,

Ans. 1. *That if it was true, that this Discourse of the Apostle, was but a single Proof ; yet the founding of the Doctrine of the Imputation of the Guilt of Adam's first Sin upon it, would not be like raising a Theory from some single Passage, for understanding of which we can have no Help either from the Context, or from any other Place of Scripture.* For here is a long and labour'd Discourse, in which the manifest Design of the Apostle is to show, that it ought not to be esteemed an incredible thing, that the Merits and Effects of the Death of Christ are imputed to us for our *Justification* ; since a much stranger thing than this, was a well known and received Truth, viz. That by

* *Barnet's Exp.* p. 115.

44 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

the Imputation of the Guilt of *Adam's* first Sin, *Judgment was come upon all Men to Condemnation.*

Ans^w. 2. *The Calvinists utterly deny, that this Discourse of the Apostle is a single Proof.* They maintain that the Doctrine of the Imputation of the Guilt of *Adam's* first Sin is as old as *Adam* himself: that as it is plain from Scripture, that the Covenant was made with *Adam*, not only for himself, but for his Posterity; and that he was threatned with Spiritual and Eternal, as well as Temporal Death, in Case of Disobedience: so it is certain from the Experience of all Ages, that all the Miseries which came upon *Adam* for his Disobedience, are derived down to all his Posterity; that they are all, not only become obnoxious to temporal Death, but are also become dead in Trespasses and Sins, as well as he. And from hence must of Necessity have followed eternal Misery to them all at length, in a greater or less Degree, unless God of his infinite Mercy had prevented, by giving his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him, might not perish; but have everlasting Life. Again it is objected,

Object. 2. * *That the Apostle seems to argue, from that Opinion of our having sinned in Adam, to prove that we are justified by Christ* Now (say the Adversaries of the Doctrine of Imputation) it is a Piece of natural Logick, not to prove a thing by another, unless that other is more known of its self, or at least more clear by its being already received and believed. This cannot be said to be more clear of its self; for it is certainly less credible or conceivable, than the Reconciliation by Christ. For we easily enough conceive how God in the Riches of

* Burnet's Exp. p. 115.

his Grace, may transfer Merit and Blessings from one Person to many, this being only a Dispensation of Mercy, where all is free, and such a Method is taken, as may best declare the Goodness of God : but in the Imputation of Sin and Guilt, which are Matters of strict Justice the Case is otherwise. Nor was this clear from any special Revelation made of it in the Old Testament. Therefore there is good Reason to believe, that it was a Doctrine then received among the *Jews* without any sufficient Foundation for it ; as there are odd things of this kind to be found among the *Cabbalists*, as if the Souls of all Mankind had been in *Adam's* Body. Now when an Argument is brought in Scripture to prove another thing by, tho' we are bound to acknowledge the Conclusion, yet we are not always sure of the Premises ; for they are often founded upon receiv'd Opinions. So that it is not certain that the Apostle designed to offer this Doctrine to our belief as true ; but only that he intended to prove by it our being reconciled to God thro' the Death of Christ. And the Medium by which he proved it might be, for ought that appears from the Words themselves, only an Opinion held true among those to whom he writes. For he only supposes it, but says nothing to prove it, which it might be expected he would have done, if the *Jews* had made any doubt of it. Upon these things the *Calvinists* observe,

Ans. 1. *That the Objection itself supposes the Imputation of Adam's Sin to his Posterity, to be a Doctrine received among the Jews.* And therefore it might at least as probably be so received from divine Revelation, as any other way ; unless some good Reason appear to the contrary.

2. *That there is no Appearance from the Apostle's Discourse, that he makes use of the Belief of this Doctrine,*

46 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

to prove our Reconciliation to God thro' Christ, only as an Argument ad Homines, or an Opinion held true, without good Authority for it, among those to whom he writes. But on the contrary we must remember, that the Epistle to the Romans was written, partly at least, if not principally, to the Gentiles, who can't be supposed to have been bigotted to any groundless Traditions of the Jews.

3. *That the Apostle's supposing this Doctrine, and not setting himself to prove it, is very well accounted for, by its being a Doctrine long before sufficiently revealed, and received as such, by all those who acknowledged the Mo-saick History to have been written under the infallible Conduct of the Spirit of God. Whereas if this Doctrine had been false, and injurious to the Perfections of God, as the Arminians and others suppose; it might reasonably be expected, that the Apostle, instead of using it as a Medium to prove another Doctrine by, would rather have set himself zealously to confute it.*

4. *Upon Supposition that the Doctrine of the Imputation of the Guilt of Adam's Sin was revealed in the Old Testament (as the Calvinists think they have sufficiently proved it was, from the Covenant of Nature between God and Adam) nothing can be more just then the Apostle's Reasoning. That it ought not to be thought strange, that the Merits and Effects of the Death of Christ are imputed to us for our Justification, since a much stranger thing than this, viz. the Imputation of the Guilt of Adam's Sin to the Condemnation of his Posterity, was a Truth long before received upon the Authority of divine Revelation, and confirmed by the Experience of all Ages.*

But

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 47

But it is objected,

Object. 3. * *That when Comparisons or Oppositions, such as this, are made in Scripture; we are not always to carry them on to an exact Equality. We are not only to be holy as God is holy, but to be perfect as he is perfect; where by the as is not to be understood a true Equality; but only some Sort of Resemblance and Conformity. Therefore those who believe, that there is nothing imputed to Adam's Posterity on the account of his Sin, but the temporary Punishment of their being made liable to Death, and to all those Miseries which the Fear of it, with our other Concerns about it, bring us under, say that this is enough to justify the Comparison which is there stated: And that those who will carry it to an exact Parallel, make a stretch beyond the Phraseology of Scripture, and the use of Parables, and of the many Comparisons that go only to one or more Points; but ought not to be stretched to every thing. Again they say further,*

That the Comparison between Adam and Christ must be only in the thing it self; and not in the Manner of the thing. That is, the Apostle indeed teaches that Guilt and Condemnation are transferred from Adam to his Posterity on the one hand, and on the other Justification from Christ, but he don't affirm that this is done from them both in the same way. For if so we must yield a Point to the Romanists, and acknowledge with them, that our Justification depends on the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ, and on the Infusion of inherent Righteousness; as our Condemnation arises, as well from Sin propagated, as from Sin imputed. Now to both these the Calvinists reply,

* Burnet's Exp: p. 115.

48 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

Ans. 1. *That the Supposition, that the Comparison here between Christ and Adam is not to be closely pursued; or that it lies only in the Thing itself, and not in the Manner of the thing; is a meer Conjecture, without any thing offered to support it.*

2. *That it is not only an unsupported Conjecture; but evidently a false one.* For it is plain from the Apostle's own Words, that the Manner of the Thing enters the Nature of the Comparison he here makes; and therefore, that we ought to consider the Cases as exactly Parallel. For the Apostle says expressly verse 18. *ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος, &c.* *That as by one Offence (and not as our Translation renders it, by the Offence of one) Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation, even so by one Righteousness, δι' ἑνὸς δικαιοσύνης, the free Gift came upon all Men to Justification of Life.* Now it is impossible that Judgment to Condemnation should come upon all Men by one Offence; or the free Gift to Justification by one Righteousness; otherwise than by the Imputation of that one Offence, or of that one Righteousness unto them. One Offence, or one Righteousness may be imputed, but can never be propagated.

3. *No Advantage can arise to the Romanists from a strict Pursuance of the Comparison.* For the meaning of the Apostle's Words cannot be stretched beyond his profess'd Design, which is not to treat of the Communication of inherent Righteousness, (which is made by Sanctification, and of which he speaks in the following Chapter) but only of imputed Righteousness.

Once more, it is objected by a late Adversary † of the Doctrine of the Imputation, &c.

† Vid. Chubb's Tracts, p. 99.

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 49

Object 4. *That when it is said, Rom. 5. 12. Wherefore as by one Man (Adam) Sin entred into the World, and Death by Sin, & so Death passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned, by the Term Sinned is only meant Mortality, the Cause being put for the Effect.* And if this be so, then the Arguments which the Calvinists build upon this and the following Verses drop of themselves, having no Foundation in the Text.

Now that by the Term *Sinned*, is meant *Mortality* (the Cause being put for the Effect) is plain (*says my Author*) not only from the parallel Place, 1 Cor. 15. 22. where St. Paul, speaking of the same thing, saith, *As in Adam all die*, that is, become mortal, for that they actually died in *Adam* was not true; but it was true that in him they become mortal, or at least the Apostle judged that to be the Case, as in Verse 21. *For since by Man (viz. Adam) came Death, or Mortality, by Man (viz. Christ) came also the Resurrection from the dead:* I say it is not only clear from the parallel Place in *Corinthians*, but also from St. Paul's Discourse in this very Place: thus Verse 15. *For if through the Offence of one (viz. Adam) many be dead;* here we see that it is Death, and not Sin, which the Apostle saith many fell under by *Adam's* Offence, and this is what he undertakes to prove in the 13th and 14th Verses, as will appear by and by. And that the Cause is put for the Effect sometimes in this very Case; see Gen. 7. 4. *If thou dost well, shalt thou not be accepted; but if thou dost not well; Sin (or the Effect of Sin, which is Punishment) lieth at the Door.* As the being accepted of God, was the Effect of *Abel's* well doing; so the being rejected by him, was the Effect of *Cain's* evil doing. Now for *Cain* to do Evil, was the same thing as to commit Sin, Sin and Evil in this Case being the same thing; and therefore that which lay at the Door, or followed his

H doing

50 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

doing Evil, was not Sin, but the Effect or Punishment of Sin; and yet God (or the Angel which spake in God's Name to *Cain*) calls it Sin, putting the Cause for the Effect. So in like Manner the Apostle puts the Term *Sin*, which was the Cause, for Mortality, which was the Effect. That all Men have sinned in *Adam* was not true; but that all Men became mortal by his Sin, was true, or at least the Apostle judged that to be the Case. What an *Hardship* therefore must it be to the Apostle, for us to interpret his Words in a Sense, contrary to the Sense which he himself gives them in this, and in a parallel Place of his Writings. And the *Hardship* will be yet greater in denying him the Liberty of putting the Cause for the Effect, when God had done the same in the Use of the very same Term, as is before shewn.

If it should be here replied, that it seems a little strange that *St. Paul* should use the same Term in *two different* Senses in the same Verse; the Author of this Interpretation answers, that it seems more strange, that he should assert that which was contrary to Truth; and which no way answered his present Design; for to assert that Death passed upon all Men, as an Effect or Consequence of their own Sin, as this was not true, so it was beside his present Purpose; which was to shew, not what was the Effect of all Mens Sin, but on the contrary what was the Effect of *Adam's Sin only*.

Verse 13, 14. *For until the Law Sin was in the World: but Sin is not imputed where there is no Law. Nevertheless Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the Similitude of Adam's Transgression.* Here in the 13th Verse the Apostle (according to the plain and most obvious Signification

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 51

Signification of the Words) supposes and allows three things. *First*, That from *Adam* to *Moses* there was no Law; this is fully implied in those Words, *until the Law*, which naturally supposes that, antecedent to that time, there was no Law; and in those Words, *where there is no Law*, which supposes that there was no Law in being at the Time referred to. *Secondly*, He allows that Sin was committed all that Space of Time, from *Adam* down to *Moses*: this is expressed in those Words, *for until the Law, Sin was in the World*. *Thirdly*, He allows that there can be no Guilt contracted where there is no Law; this is expressed in those Words, *but Sin is not imputed, where there is no Law*. Now in his allowing these three Points he is guilty of a flat Contradiction; for if there is no Guilt contracted where there is no Law, and if there was no Law in being from *Adam* to *Moses*, then it will necessarily follow that there could be no Guilt contracted in that Space of Time; and yet the Apostle expressly asserts, that until the Law, Sin was in the World. This puts us under a Necessity of finding out such a Sense of these Words as will make *St. Paul* consistent with *Truth*, and with *Himself*, viz. by the Term *Law*, in the first Part of the Verse, he means the Law given by *Moses*, as appears from the next Verse; in which he saith, Nevertheless Death reigned from *Adam* to *Moses*; where the Term *nevertheless* supposes that *Death* prevailed at the same Time in which he had declared *Sin* had prevailed, as in the precedent Verse, viz. till the Law: So that, till the Law, and from *Adam* to *Moses*, is the same thing in the Sense of the *Apostle*. By the Term *Law*, in the latter Part of the Verse, he means such a Law as had *Death* fixed to it as its *Sanction*; such was the Law given to *Adam*; which forbade the eating of the Tree of Knowledge upon Pain of

H 2

Death.

52 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

Death: By the imputing of Sin, the Apostle means the inflicting of Death as a Punishment for the Breach of such a Law; as much as if he had said, Death is not inflicted as a Punishment for the Breach of a Law; except there be some positive Law which declares that Death is fixed to it as it's Sanction. And that this is his meaning appears from Verse 14, where he saith, *that Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the Similitude of Adam's Transgression.* Here he allows, that those Death reigned over might be Sinners, but he denies that they had been guilty of the Breach of such a Law as *Adam* had; they had not transgressed a positive Law which had Death fixed to it as its Sanction. Now if they had been guilty of Sin, which the Apostle here allows they might, and in the former Verse asserts that they had, and if Sin is the Transgression of a Law, and if they had not transgressed such a Law as *Adam* did, then it will follow, that if the Apostle is consistent with himself, he makes a *Distinction* between Law and Law: they had transgressed the Law of Nature, or the Law given to *Noah*, and this made them guilty of Sin; but they had not transgressed such a positive Law, as had Death fixed to it as it's Sanction, and so they had not sinned after the *Similitude* or *Likeness* of *Adam's* Transgression; and therefore Death was not inflicted on them as a Punishment for the Breach of such a Law, but was to them only as a Consequence of that *Mortality*, which *Adam* bro't upon himself by transgressing as aforesaid. The Sense of the two Verses then is this, *viz.* tho' we must allow on the one Side, that Sin prevailed in the World all that Space of Time, from *Adam* down to the giving of the Law of *Moses*; and as we must allow on the other Side, that Death is not inflicted as a Punishment for the Breach of a Law; where
there

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 53

there is no Law, which had declared that Death is fixed to it as its Sanction ; yet, notwithstanding this, Death prevailed from *Adam* to *Moses* over those who had not transgressed such a Law ; and consequently Death could not be inflicted upon them for the Breach of a Law which they had not transgressed, but only it was a Consequence of that Mortality, which *Adam* bro't upon himself for the breaking of such a Law.

Verse 15. *But not as the Offence, so also is the free Gift: for if thro' the Offence of one many be dead ; much more the Grace of God, and the Gift by Grace, which is by one Man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.* Which is, as if the Apostle had said, tho' *Adam* was a *Figure* and *Type* of *Christ*, and tho' the Breach he made upon humane Nature was *universal*, yet, so great is the Favour and Gift of God to us in and thro' *Christ*, that the Reparation made by him, is as *great* and *universal* to Mankind, as the afore-said Damage done by *Adam*: for if by *Adam's Sin*, all Mankind have fallen under the Sentence of Death ; much more the Grace of God, which hath been displayed in giving *Christ* to Death for us, and in giving the future Resurrection from the dead thro' him, shall be extended to *all Mankind* also.

Verse 16. *And not as it was by one that sinned so is the Gift: for the Judgment was by one to Condemnation ; but the free Gift is of many Offences unto Justification.* Which is as much as if he had said, the Grace which God hath vouchsafed to Mankind in *Christ Jesus*, is *more abundant* than the Sentence laid upon *Adam*, as appears from this, *viz.* the Sentence of Death which passed upon *Adam* was for only one single Offence ; but the Gift of a future Resurrection, which God hath given to Mankind
in

54 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

in and thro' Christ Jesus, is vouchsafed to us, tho' we have been guilty, not only of one, but of *many Offences*.

Verse 17. *For if by one Mans Offence Death reigned by one ; much more they which receive abundance of Grace, and of the Gift of Righteousness, shall reign in Life by one Jesus Christ.* Which is as much as if he had said, for if by one Offence of Adam, Death passed upon all his Posterity, much more shall they *all*, to whom God hath super-abounded in Grace, in giving his Son to Death for them (even all Mankind) be restored to Life again thro' him.

Verse 18. *Therefore as by the Offence of one Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation, even so by the Righteousness of one, the free Gift came upon all Men unto Justification of Life.* Which is as much as if he had said, therefore as by one Offence, even Adam's eating the forbidden Fruit ; all Men fell under the Condemnation of Death ; so by one *Act* of Righteousness, or Obedience, *viz.* Christ's Obedience to Death upon the Cross, all Men are restored to Life again.

Verse 19. *For as by one Mans Disobedience, many were made Sinners (bro't into a State of Mortality, the Cause being here put for the Effect) so by the Obedience of one, shall many be made Righteous.* Which is as much as if he had said, for as by Adam's Sin his Posterity became *Mortal*, and so passed into a State of Death, which is the State of Sinners ; so by Christ's Obedience unto Death, even the Death of the Cross, all Adam's Posterity, both *Jew* and *Gentile*, are restored again to a State of Life, which in that respect is the State of the *Righteous*.

That

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 55

That by the Terms *Life*, and *Justification of Life*; and the like Expressions, in the foregoing Verses, is not meant that *eternal Life* which will be the Portion and Inheritance of the Faithful, but only a bare *Resurrection* from that temporal Death, which hath passed upon all Men, as a Consequence or Effect of *Adam's Sin*, is plain from this, *viz.* That it will be universal to all over whom Death hath prevailed, which is all Mankind: whereas the eternal Life, before mentioned, is every where declared in the Scriptures to be the Portion of none but the Faithful. The Apostle, in the foregoing Verses, makes it his Business to prove, that the *Benefit* and *Advantage* Mankind have by *Christ*, is as great and *universal* as the *Damage* done by *Adam*, in order to prove, that the *Gentiles* have as great a Share in *Christ* as the *Jews*; and therefore, in his Reasoning upon this Subject, he puts the Term *Life*, which he represents as a Benefit from *Christ*, in Opposition to the Term *Death*, which he represents as a Damage coming from *Adam*: and he makes the Benefit of the one, to be as *extensive & universal* as the other; which can be true in no other Case, than in the general Resurrection of all Mankind, according to his own Words, in 1 Cor. 15. 21, 22. *For since by Man came Death, by Man came also the Resurrection of the Dead: for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive, or raised again from the dead.* Thus far he.

Upon which he concludes, Thus I think I have vindicated the *Righteousness* of *God*, and the *Doctrine* of *St. Paul*, from the unjust Reflections cast upon both.

Answer. And now in answer to all this the Calvinists reply, That the whole of this Interpretation turns entirely upon two Suppositions, which are both of them manifest and great Mistakes:

These

*in the above village to the man
to raise the dead again to be
the same as a resurrection*

56 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

These are,

1. *That by the Term Sinned in the 12th Verse, is meant Mortality, the Cause being put for the Effect.*

And,

2. *That by the Terms Life, and Justification of Life, and the like Expressions, in the following Verses, is not meant that eternal Life which will be the Portion and Inheritance of the Faithful, but only a bare Resurrection from that temporal Death, which hath passed upon all Men, as a Consequence or Effect of Adam's Sin.*

And here,

1. With respect to the first of these Suppositions, viz. *that by the Term Sinned, verse 12, is meant Mortality, the Cause being put for the Effect*; they say it is manifestly a great Mistake, because *the having sinned is here evidently assigned as the Reason of that very Effect, which the Objection supposes it to be put for.* In the former Part of the Verse the Apostle assigns the Reason of *Death's entrance into the World, which was Sin; by one Man Sin entered into the World, and Death by Sin;* and in this latter Part of the Verse he assigns the same Reason for *Death's passing upon all Men; and so Death passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned.* Here is as clear a Distinction between Sin and Death in this latter Member of the Verse, as there is in the former. And the *Progress of Death in the World* is declared to be after the same Manner, and for the same Reason, that the *Entrance of it was: by one Man Sin entered into the World, and Death by Sin; and so Death passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned.* From whence it appears, as plainly as any thing well can do; that if by the Term *Sinned* be meant *Mortality* in the latter Part of the Verse, the same thing must be meant by the Term *Sin* in the former Part of the Verse. And then the meaning of the Apostle must be, that *by one Man Mortality entered into the World, and Death by Mortality; and*

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 57

so Death passed upon all Men, for that all are become Mortal. But this is a Sense so absurd in it self, and so foreign to all that follows in the Chapter, that the Calvinists think it would be an exceeding great Hardship to the Apostle, for us to interpret his Words in such a Manner, contrary to the Sense which he himself gives them in the whole Remainder of his Discourse upon this Subject; in which it is impossible to imagine, that he means only Mortality, when he speaks of the Sin which was in the World until the Law, and which is not imputed where there is no Law; of those that had not sinned after the Similitude of Adam's Transgression; and of the Offence, the Sin, the Disobedience of one Man; by which many were made Sinners, died, and came under Judgment to Condemnation *. But however absurd in itself, and incoherent with the rest of the Apostle's Discourse, this Gentleman's Interpretation may seem to the Calvinists, he offers three Reasons to justify it; which being, some of them, pretty remarkable, ought not to be passed over without Notice. First then he says,

Reason 1. That by the Term Sinned is meant Mortality (the Cause being put for the Effect) is plain from the parallel Place 1 Cor. 15. 22. Where St. Paul, speaking of the same thing, says, As in Adam all die, that is, become Mortal, for that they actually died in Adam was not true; but it was true that in him they become Mortal, or at least the Apostle judged that to be the Case, as in Verse 21. For since by Man (viz. Adam) came Death, or Mortality, by Man (viz. Christ) came also the Resurrection from the dead. To this the Calvinists reply,

* Verse 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19.

58 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

Reply. That the Apostle is not speaking of the same thing in what this Gentleman calls the parallel Place. That here Rom. 5. 12. the Apostle says, *All have sinned, and so (or for that Reason) Death passed upon all*: Whereas in 1 Cor. 15. 22. he only says, *All die*, and mentions nothing of the Reason of it. Now supposing that the Apostle, by the Terms *all die* in one Place, means that *all are become Mortal*; yet it is strange Arguing to conclude from hence, that by the Terms *all have sinned* in another Place, he can mean nothing but *Mortality*, the Cause being put for the Effect; when he manifestly alledges this Cause as the Reason of that Effect, saying, *And so Death passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned*. When the Cause and the Effect are both mentioned together, and the former is offered as the Reason of the latter, is it possible that the Effect only should be intended by them both? And is this Consequence, that *if dying signifies becoming Mortal, then sinning must do so too*, clear and evident enough to force us into such a Supposition? But the Gentleman urges farther,

Reason 2. That it is also clear, that by the Term *Sinned* is meant *Mortality* (the Cause being put for the Effect) from St. Paul's Discourse in this very Place: thus Verse 15. *For if thro' the Offence of one (viz. Adam) many be dead*; here we see that it is Death, and not Sin, which the Apostle says many fell under by Adam's Offence; and this he undertakes to prove in the 13th and 14th Verses. To which the Calvinists reply,

Reply. That this hath just as much Weight in it, and no more, than if a Man should recite those Words in the 19th Verse, *by one Man's Disobedience many were made Sinners*; and then conclude from thence,

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 59

thence, Here we see that it is Sin, and not Death, which the Apostle says many fell under by Adam's Disobedience. The Truth is, the Apostle had plainly told us Verse 12, that all Men were fallen under both Sin and Death, and under Death because under Sin, by Adam's Disobedience. And in the following Verses he speaks, sometimes only of one, and sometimes only of the other of these Calamities, which that Act of Disobedience hath bro't upon us. But he never speaks of either of them after such a Manner, as to deny the other to be an Effect of Adam's Sin; but rather so as to suppose it. And this is manifestly the Case, when he says Verse 15, that thro' the Offence of one (viz. Adam) many are dead. For it follows in the next Verse, that the Judgment was of one (viz. Sin or Offence) to Condemnation; from whence it appears plainly, that the Death which came upon many thro' the Offence of one, was not a bare Consequence of that Mortality which Adam bro't upon himself by transgressing; but was the Effect of a judicial Sentence of God condemning them unto it, for that one Offence of Adam. And this certainly supposes the Guilt of that one Offence to be some way or other chargeable upon them; or else the Judgment of God would not be according to Truth in condemning them to Death for it. Again,

The Calvinists apprehend it a great Misrepresentation of the Apostle to say, that in the 13th and 14th Verses he undertakes to prove, that it was Death, and not Sin, which many fell under by Adam's Offence. Indeed they readily agree with their Adversary, that the Apostle in the 13th Verse makes a Distinction between Law & Law; and that by the Term Law, in the first Part of the Verse, he means the Law given by Moses; and they maintain, that by the Term Law in the latter Part of the Verse, he must mean some other Law,

60 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

by virtue of which *Sin was imputed* to Men before the Law of *Moses* was given. For, that *Sin was then in the World*, the Apostle himself expressly affirms in the former Part of the Verse ; and that it was *then imputed too*, or Guilt contracted by it, is also evident ; because he tells us, Verse 14, that *Death (which is the Wages of Sin, Rom. 6. 23.) reigned from Adam to Moses.*

Here then the Question arises, *What this Law was*, by virtue of which *all were reputed Sinners*, and so *Death passed upon all*, before the Law of *Moses* was given ? Whether it was the Law of Nature given to *Noah **, as this Gentleman speaks ; or the Law given to *Adam*, which forbade the eating of the Tree of Knowledge upon Pain of Death ? Now the Calvinists suppose, it must necessarily be understood of the latter ; because that as this Gentleman himself confesses, *the Apostle here allows, that those over whom Death reigned from Adam to Moses might have been guilty of Sin ; and in the former Verse he asserts that they had.* Now it is certain, that a considerable Part of them had never been guilty of any Sin against the Law of Nature ; for we know that between *Adam* and *Moses* many died in Infancy, who could therefore be guilty of Sin no other way, than as the Guilt of *Adam's* first Sin was imputed to them. And therefore the Apostle saith, Verse 14, that *they had not sinned after the Similitude of Adam's Transgression*, because they were Sinners only by Imputation, having never actually transgressed any Law of God, as *Adam* did, in their own Persons. For that such as these are the Persons whom the Apostle means, and not (according to this Gentleman) such as had on-

* He should have said given to *Adam*, unless he thinks the Men of the Old World were not Sinners.
See Advertisement at beginning of Book.

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 61

ly sinned against the Law of Nature, the Calvinists think to be farther certain ; because they apprehend, that *Death was from the Beginning fixed to the Law of Nature as its Sanction*, as truly, as it was to the Law respecting the Tree of Knowledge. And this, they say is evident from Scripture, from Fact, and from the Reason of the Thing it self.

1. From Scripture. Which teaches us, that the *Wages of Sin is Death*, Rom. 6. 23.

2. From Fact. Which assures us that God destroyed the Men of the *old World*, and the Men of Sodom; not in Consequence of that Mortality, which Adam bro't upon himself ; but as a Punishment for their Sins against the Law of Nature. And finally,

3. From the Reason of the Thing it self. For tho' at the Beginning, we find only one Instance of Rebellion against God (*viz.* that of eating of the Tree of Knowledge) expressly threatned with Death ; yet we cannot suppose, but that if our first Parents had contradicted the known Will of God in any other Point of equal Importance, they must have expected the same, or some other equivalent Punishment. If God would not suffer a mere positive Law, relating only to their Food, to escape without so severe a Punishment ; it was impossible they should be so stupid, as to expect Impunity, or less Severity, if they should transgress any of those moral Laws, which were written on their Hearts. And if God was pleased to magnify his own Authority, and do it so much Honour, as to threaten to punish with Death the disregard of it, even in a Matter indifferent in its own Nature, and which had no other Foundation, but his sovereign Will ; how much more solicitous must our first Parents in all Reason suppose

62 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

suppose he would be, to vindicate his own Honour, and punish every Transgression and Disobedience, where the Things commanded and forbidden were of such a Nature, that the divine Perfections could not but command and forbid them? So that the awful Threatning with which the Observance of the Law relating to the Fruit of the Tree of Knowledge was enforced, was abundantly sufficient to deter our first Parents from Disobedience to any Article of the Moral Law, or Law of Nature. As the Light of that Understanding which God had given them, was sufficient to enable them to discern what the Law of Nature was; so it could not but be sufficient to enable them to perceive, that any Transgression of the Law of Nature would deserve to be punished with Death, as much at least, if not more, than that meer positive Law, which had Death expressly annexed to it, as it's Sanction. And we might as well doubt, whether Mankind was under the Law of Nature from the Beginning, because the Scriptures say nothing of any Revelation of it to them so early; as doubt whether Death was from the Beginning annexed to it as its Sanction, because the Scriptures don't expressly tell us that it was.

Especially if we consider (what hath been observ'd before) that God did in Fact, from the Beginning, punish Men with Death time after time, for their Transgressions of the Law of Nature. And this Gentleman himself maintains, that *Death is not inflicted as a Punishment for the Breach of a Law, to which it is not fixed as its Sanction.* Now if Death is not inflicted as a Punishment for the Breach of a Law to which it is not fixed as it's Sanction; and yet Death was in Fact, time after time from the Days of *Adam* to those of *Moses* inflicted on Men by God, as a Punishment for their Transgressions of the Law

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 63

of Nature ; it follows that Death was in those Days fixed to the Law of Nature as it's Sanction. And therefore, that all from *Adam* to *Moses*, who transgressed the Law of Nature, *sinned after the Similitude of Adam's Transgression* ; both as they sinned actually in their own Persons, and as they sinned against a Law, which had Death fixed to it as it's Sanction. From whence it follows, that by those *over whom Death reigned from Adam to Moses*, and yet *who had not sinned after the Similitude of Adam's Transgression*, the Apostle must mean such, as had never been guilty of any actual Sin in their own Persons ; but only had the Guilt of *Adam's* first Sin imputed to them. And thus it appears, that the Apostle is so far from undertaking to prove in the 13th and 14th Verses, that it was *Death*, and *not Sin*, which many fell under by *Adam's* Offence ; that on the contrary he both undertakes to prove, and does prove, that they fell under *Sin*, as well as under *Death*, by that Offence ; and that they fell under *Death* by it, because they fell under *Sin* by it.

There will be no need of enquiring now, whether the Term *Sin*, *Gen. 4. 7.* means *Punishment* ? Or whether the Terms *lieth at the Door* intend *followeth*, as this Gentleman supposes ? For if he could find twenty Instances in his Bible where *Sin* was put for *Punishment* ; yet enough hath been said to show, that by the Term *Sinned* is not meant *Mortality*, *Rom. 5. 12.* unless there be Strength enough in his third Reason to bear down all that hath been offer'd in Opposition to his two former. We must therefore now proceed to consider that, which is,

Reason 3. *That to assert that Death passed upon all Men, as an Effect or Consequence of their own Sin, was beside the Apostle's present Purpose ; which was to show,*
not

64 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

not what was the Effect of all Mens Sin, but on the contrary, what was the Effect of Adam's Sin only. Now to this the Calvinists reply,

Reply. *That it is a meer Amusement grounded only on the Sound of Words, without attending to the Sense and Design of them. That there is no contrariety in supposing the same Sin to be Adam's only in one respect, and to be all Men's Sin in another. That this is the Case of the Sin, which the Apostle is here speaking of, viz. Adam's first Act of Disobedience ; which was his Sin only with respect to actual Commission ; but was all Mens Sin with respect to Imputation. That therefore, when the Apostle saith, that Death passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned, he don't mean that they had all sinned in their own Persons actually ; (for this would be to contradict what he himself says afterwards, Verse 14, that Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the Similitude of Adam's Transgression) but he must intend that Death had passed upon them all, because they had all sinned in Adam, that is, because the Sin of Adam was by the righteous Judgment of God imputed to them all. And to this agrees the most literal, exact Rendering of the Apostle's Words, which is not for that, but in whom (ἐφ' ᾧ) all have sinned. Now nothing could be more to the Apostle's Purpose, than to assert, that Death passed upon all Men, as a Punishment of that Sin, which was their own by Imputation only, being no Mans Sin but Adam's with respect to actual Commission. And therefore there is no more Ground from this third Reason, than from the two former, to suppose that the Apostle speaks absurdly, putting the Cause for the Effect, when he mentions them both together, and offers the former, as the Reason of the latter.*

Bu,

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 65

But it is time now to consider what the Calvinists have to say, to the second Supposition, upon which this Gentleman grounds his Interpretation of this Discourse of the Apostle, which is,

2. *That by the Terms Life, and Justification of Life, and the like Expressions, in this Discourse, is not meant that eternal Life which will be the Portion and Inheritance of the Faithful; but only a bare Resurrection from that temporal Death, which had passed upon all Men, as a Consequence or Effect of Adam's Sin.* And to this the Calvinists reply,

Ans^r. *That if the Gentleman had tho't fit to carry on his Paraphrase to the two remaining Verses of this Chapter, he could not have avoided seeing, that the Apostle, by the Terms Life, and Justification of Life, and the like Expressions in this Discourse, certainly meant that eternal Life, which will be the Portion and Inheritance of the Faithful.* For in the 21st Verse the Apostle draws up the Conclusion of the whole Matter, which he had been arguing thro' the preceeding Verses, in the following Words; *That as Sin hath reigned unto Death, even so might Grace reign thro' Righteousness unto eternal Life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.*

But the Gentleman argues, that the *Life* imported in these Expressions cannot be *eternal Life*, for this plain Reason, namely, that it will be *universal* to all over whom *Death* hath prevailed, which is all Mankind: Whereas *eternal Life* is every where declared in the Scriptures to be the Portion of none but the Faithful. The Apostle in the foregoing Verses, makes it his Business to prove, that the Benefit and Advantage Mankind have by *Christ*, is as great and *universal* as the Damage done by *Adam*; and therefore, in his Reasoning upon this Subject,

K

he

66 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

he puts the Term *Life*, which he represents as a Benefit from *Christ*, in Opposition to the Term *Death*, which he represents as a Damage coming from *Adam*. And he makes the Benefit of the one, to be as *extensive* and *universal* as the Damage of the other, which can be true in no other Case, than in the general Resurrection of all Mankind. To which the *Calvinists* reply,

1. *That it is strange Confidence, to pretend to understand the Importance of the Apostle's Expressions, better than he did himself; and to maintain, that he cannot mean eternal Life, when he himself expressly affirms he does. And indeed, if the Apostle had not, in the last Verse of the Chapter, declared this to be his Meaning; yet it would have been very unreasonable to imagine, that he could intend any thing less than eternal Life by some of the Expressions, which he uses in the preceeding Verses; as particularly when he says, Verse 17, that they which receive abundance of Grace, and of the Gift of Righteousness, shall reign in Life by one, Jesus Christ. For who can imagine that the Apostle would express a bare Resurrection from temporal Death, which to Multitudes will be a Resurrection of Damnation, by such Terms as reigning in Life by Jesus Christ? Is it possible that reigning in Life by Jesus Christ should intend only coming out of the Grave at the Voice of the Son of God, in order to be doomed to depart from him into everlasting Fire, prepared for the Devil and his Angels? Or can such a bare Resurrection from temporal Death be deemed a Benefit as great to the Subjects of it, as the Damage done them by the Sin of Adam? The Calvinists therefore observe,*

2. *That the Life, which the Apostle intends by these Expressions, will not be universal to all over whom*
Death

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 67

Death hath prevailed. For they apprehend it a great Mistake in this Gentleman to suppose, that the Apostle, in the foregoing Verses, *makes it his Business to prove, that the Benefit and Advantage Mankind have by Christ, is as universal, as the Damage done by Adam.* What the Apostle urges is, not that the Benefit Mankind have by *Christ* is as *universal* as the Damage done by the Sin of *Adam*; but that it is *much more obvious and easy to be conceived*: that (as hath been observ'd before p. 46) it ought not to be tho't strange, that the Merits and Effects of the Death of *Christ* are imputed to us for our Justification; since a much stranger thing than this, namely, the Imputation of the Guilt of *Adam's Sin* to the Condemnation of his Posterity, was a Truth long before received.

Now that this must be the Apostle's meaning is evident from the Form of Expression which he uses, Verse 18, *For if thro' the Offence of one (Man) many be dead; much more the Grace of God, and the Gift by Grace, which is by one Man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.* And again, Verse 17, *If by one Mans Offence, (or by one Offence, as it is rendred in the Margin of our Bibles) Death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of Grace, and of the Gift of Righteousness, shall reign in Life by one, Jesus Christ.* The manifest Design of the Apostle in these Verses is, not to represent the Benefit Mankind have by *Christ*, as *exactly equal and like* to the Damage done by *Adam*; but as *unlike* to it, and *differing* from it. [*Not as the Offence, so also is the Gift, says he, Verse 15. And again, Not as it was by one that sinned, so is the Gift, Verse 16.*] And this Difference the Apostle represents as such, that the Term *much more* may, in some respect or other, be applied to the Benefit Mankind have by *Christ*, when it is

68 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

compared with the Damage done by *Adam*. Now in what respect can this be? Surely the Gentleman himself wont say, that it is in respect of *Extensiveness* and *Universality*: that the Benefit by *Christ* shall be *much more universal*, than the Damage done by *Adam*; that *many more* shall be *made alive in Christ*, than ever *died in Adam*. This is both false in Fact, and absurd in the Nature of the Thing; and therefore cannot be the Apostle's meaning. But it is both true in Fact and obvious to every one, that the Terms *much more*, with respect to *Credibility* and *Easiness of Conception*, may very properly be applied to the Benefits we receive by *Christ*, when they are compared with the Damage derived to us from *Adam*. For it is allowed on all Hands to be much easier to conceive, how God in the Riches of his Grace, may transfer Merit and Blessings from one Person to many; than how he can impute the Guilt of the Sin of one to many, consistently with his Justice. And since this is both true in Fact, and renders the Apostle's Reasoning just and natural, we may very well conclude this to be the Drift of it.

Nor does there seem to be any thing in the Context, which could lead a Man into an Apprehension, that the Design of the Apostle was to prove, that the Benefit Mankind have by *Christ*, is as *universal* as the Damage done by *Adam*; unless it be that he says Verse 18, *Therefore, as by the Offence of one* (or rather, *by one Offence*) *Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation*; even so *by the Righteousness of one* (or *by one Righteousness*) *the free Gift came upon all Men unto Justification of Life*. Upon which the Calvinists observe,

That the Terms *all Men* are not to be understood *absolutely without Exception* in either Part of this Verse;

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 69

Verse ; any more than they are to be so understood, when *Ananias*, upon *Saul's* receiving his Sight, saith unto him *Acts* 22. 15, *Thou shalt be his Witness unto all Men, of what thou hast seen and heard.* And this, they think, is fairly intimated by the Apostle's using the Terms *all Men*, and *many*, Verse 12, 15, 18, 19, as Terms of one and the same Importance in his Intention. For he considers † *Adam & Christ* as the constituted Heads and Representatives of *their respective Posterity*. And in the Comparison he runs between them, he indifferently uses the Terms *all Men*, and *many*, to signify *that Number which they do respectively represent.* The *many*, or *all Men* represented by *Adam*, are *all those many, who are born of him in the Way of Nature*, and no more. And the *many*, or *all Men* represented by *Christ*, are *all those many, who are born of him in the Way of Grace*, and no more. For,

I. *Adam did not represent all Mankind without Exception : but only those of them, who were born of him in the Way of Nature, or by ordinary Generation.* For *Christ* was as really *Man*, as *Adam* was ; but being born of *Adam* out of the Way of Nature, or by extraordinary Generation, he came not into the Number of those represented by *Adam*. This is evident in that every one whom *Adam* represented must needs have *sinned in him* ; as hath been proved above. But *Christ* was holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from Sinners ; and even the Sin he suffered for, was imputed to him, not as he was a *Man* ; but as he was a *Surety for and Redeemer of Man.*

† Vid. *Gomar. Par. Wil. in Loc.* And *Mr. Paine's Sermon on Orig. Sin. p. 3.*

And

70 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

And,

2. *Christ did not represent, either all Mankind, or all whom Adam represented: but only all those, who are, or shall be born of him, in the Way of Grace.* For none but these, shall reign in Life by Jesus Christ; nor are any but these, made righteous by his Obedience. And it is quite contrary to the whole Current of the Apostle's Reasoning in this Chapter to suppose, that the Obedience of Christ is less effectual to bring down Benefits upon those, that are represented by him; than the Sin of Adam was to bring down Mischief, upon those whom he represented. So far is such a Supposition from being true, that the Apostle declares the Representativenesship of Christ to be rather more, than less evidently effectual than the Representativenesship of Adam, by applying the Terms much more once and again to the former, when compared with the latter,

Since then Adam did not represent all Mankind without Exception; and since Christ did not represent all whom Adam represented: since Judgment to Condemnation did not come upon all Men without Exception by the Offence of Adam; nor the free Gift to Justification of Life, upon all Men without Exception, by the Righteousness of Christ; it is impossible that the Apostle by the Terms *all Men* in the 18th Verse should intend any more, than *all those, who are respectively represented by Adam and Christ.* Nor is such a limited use of the Word *all*, to denote only all of some certain Sort of Persons, unfrequent in the Scriptures of the New Testament: as when our Lord himself says, Joh. 10. 8. *All that ever came before me, are Thieves and Robbers:* And when the Apostle saith, Phil. 2. 21. *All seek their own, not the Things which are Jesus Christs.*

And

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 71

And now the Sum is, That by the Terms *Life, Justification of Life, and reigning in Life by Jesus Christ*, the Apostle certainly means *eternal Life*; both because some of the Expressions will not admit of any other tolerable Sense, and because the Apostle himself expressly uses the Terms *eternal Life*, in drawing up the Conclusion of the whole Matter, which he had been arguing in this Chapter: That *eternal Life* is every where declared in the Scriptures to be the Portion and Inheritance of none but the Faithful: That therefore the Apostle does not, nor can, make it his Business to prove, that the Benefit Mankind have by *Christ*, which he speaks of under the Terms *Life, Justification of Life, &c.* is as *universal* as the Damage done by *Adam*; but only, that it is *much more easy to be apprehended and believed*: That this is evidently his Intention from the Terms *much more*, which he once and again applies to the Benefit we receive by *Christ*, when compared with the Damage derived to us from *Adam*: In fine, that the Terms *all Men* in the 18th Verse import nothing contrary to this, since it is plain from the Nature of the Things there spoken of, that they are not to be understood *absolutely without Exception*; since the Apostle himself fairly intimates that he did not intend them so, by using the Terms *all Men* and *many*, Verse 12, 15, 18, 19, as Expressions of one and the same Importance; and since such a limited Sense of the Terms *all Men*, as denotes *only all of some certain Sort*, is frequent elsewhere in the New Testament *. Thus the *Calvinists* think they have vindicated the Apostle Paul from the Charge, of absurdly meaning *only a bare Resurrection from temporal Death*,

* Besides the Instances cited above, see Luke 6. 26: John 11. 48. Col. 1. 28. & Tim. 6. 19.

72 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

by such Expressions as *Justification of Life*, and *reigning in Life by Jesus Christ*. And as for the *Righteousness of God* in imputing the *Guilt of the Sin of Adam* to all his Posterity by ordinary Generation; they trust they have fully vindicated that also from the unjust Reflections cast upon it, under their first Argument from the *Covenant of Nature between God and Adam*.

I have now shown, where the chief Strength of the Calvinists, (who maintain the Doctrine of the *Imputation of the Guilt of Adam's first Sin*) as I apprehend it, lies; namely in what they argue from the *Covenant of Nature between God and Adam*; And in the Arguments they draw from that large Discourse of the Apostle Paul, *Rom. 5.* from the 11th Verse, to the End of the Chapter.

I have likewise faithfully represented (so far as they have fallen within my Observation) the best Things which the *Arminians*, or others offer, to take off the Force of these Arguments. And now it is time to pass over to the other Side, and take a View,

2. Of what the *Arminians*, or others argue against the *Imputation of the Guilt of Adam's Sin to his Posterity*: And of what the Calvinists in their Turn object or reply to them. Now the *Arminians* and others argue against the Truth of this Doctrine chiefly from two Considerations, namely,

1. A supposed Inconsistency of it with the divine Perfections. And,

2. From a supposed Contradictoriness of it to the Scriptures.

1. The

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 73

I. They say, it is inconsistent with the divine Perfections, that all the Posterity of Adam by ordinary Generation, should be made Sinners, by the Imputation of the Guilt of his first Act of Disobedience to them ; and therefore such a Doctrine cannot be true. * It seems repugnant to the Truth, and Justice, and Goodness of God, to reckon Men guilty of a Sin which they never committed, and to punish them in their Soul's eternally, for that which was no Act of theirs. And tho' (as hath been observ'd before) we easily enough conceive how God in the Riches of his Grace, may transfer Merit and Blessings from one Person to many, this being only an Oeconomy of Mercy, where all is free, and such a Method is taken as may best declare the Goodness of God : but in the Imputation of Sin and Guilt which are Matters of strict Justice, it is quite otherwise. Upon this Head God is often pleased to appeal to Men of the Justice of all his Ways. And therefore no such Doctrine ought to be admitted, that carries in it an Idea of Cruelty, beyond what the blackest Tyrants ever have invented. And tho' in Articles relating to the Nature of God, they acknowledge it is highly reasonable to believe, that there may be Mysteries which exceed our Capacity : Yet in Moral Matters, in God's federal Dealings with us, it seems unreasonable, and contrary to the Nature of God, to believe that there may be a Mystery contrary to the clearest Notions of Justice & Goodness ; such as the condemning Mankind for the Sin of one Man, in which the rest had no Share ; and tho' they were never in any respect capable of concurring towards it. To this Argument the Calvinists reply,

* Burnet's Exp. p. 114.

74 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

Answ. That here is no Mystery at all in the Case; That here is not so much as an Appearance of Inconsistency (to one who considers the Matter well) with any of the divine Perfections: That they are willing to put the whole Dispute upon this Issue, and will never more pretend to assert the Imputation of the Guilt of Adam's Sin to his Posterity, if they can't make it out to be consistent with all the Attributes of God. Now this they think they shall do effectually, if they prove the three things following, viz.

1. That the Advantage promised to Adam for himself and Posterity upon Condition of his Obedience, was more than proportionable to the Disadvantage threatened in Case of Disobedience.

2. That it was better in the Nature of the Thing for the Posterity of Adam, that he should be appointed by God to represent them, and act for them; than that they should have been appointed, each Man to stand or fall by himself. And,

3. That it is impossible it should be inconsistent with any of the divine Perfections, for God to deal with the Posterity of Adam, according to the Terms of a Covenant in its own Nature Equitable, and for their Good. The Calvinists then maintain,

1. That the Advantage promised to Adam for himself, and his Posterity, upon Condition of his perfect Obedience, was more than proportionable to the Disadvantage threatened in Case of Disobedience. 'Tis true, Life Eternal, which was promis'd upon Condition of Adam's perfect Obedience, is not in it self a greater Good; than Eternal Death, which was threatened in Case of Disobedience, is an Evil. But tho' the Good promised, was not in its own Nature greater, than the
Evil

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 75

Evil threatned ; yet it was more *unmeritable*, and in that respect *more than proportionable*. For the *proper Wages* of Sin against God is *Eternal Death*, according to the strictest Rules of Justice : but since the Creature cannot be profitable to the Creator, *eternal Life* could never have been *deserved* by the most perfect Obedience ; but must have been the *unmerited Gift of God*. Indeed an innocent Creature may reasonably expect thus much from the Goodness of God, and from his Justice too, that Existence, so long as God pleases to continue it, shall be an Happiness and not a Misery. But Existence it self is what no Creature hath a Right to ; and therefore, much less can it have a Right to the eternal Continuance of an happy Existence ; unless God, of his abundant Goodness, shall think fit by Promise, or Covenant, to make over such a Right unto it. So then, when God promised *eternal Life* and *Happiness* unto *Adam*, and his Posterity, upon Condition of *Adam's* perfect Obedience ; he promised, what *Adam* could never have deserved for himself, and much less for his Posterity, and so could have had no claim to, either for himself, or them, had it not been for the Covenant Promise of God : Whereas, when he threatned *eternal Death*, in Case of Disobedience, he threatned nothing more than what would have been the just Desert of Sin, had there been no expresse Threatning at all annexed to the divine Command : Tho' it is readily allowed, that the Posterity of *Adam* would not have been involved in Sin and Guilt with him, had he not been appointed of God to represent them, and act for them. But since the Blessing promised to Obedience, was what *Adam* himself could have had no Claim to, without a divine Promise ; whereas the Punishment threatned to Disobedience, would without any Threatning have been his just Desert upon sinning

L. 2

against

against God; the *Calvinists* think that the Covenant, so far as *Adam* himself only was concerned in it, was undeniably, not only Equitable, but exceeding Kind and Good. Nor could any Dispute, with the least Pretence of Reason, ever have been raised concerning the Equity or Goodness of it, had the same Terms been propounded to each of the Posterity of *Adam* for himself only, which were propounded to *Adam*, both for himself, and his Posterity. And therefore there can be no Ground of Cavil, unless it was inconsistent with the divine Perfections, that *Adam* should be appointed of God to represent his Posterity, and act for them. In Opposition to which the *Calvinists* affirm,

2. *That it was better in the Nature of the Thing for the Posterity of Adam, that he should be appointed by God to represent them, and act for them; than that they should have been appointed, every Man to stand, or fall, by himself.* That it was best the Covenant should be so made with *Adam*, as that all his Posterity should share with him in Life and Happiness, upon Condition of his perfect Obedience; or become obnoxious with him to Death or Misery, in Case of his Disobedience: The Reasons with which the *Calvinists* endeavour to support this Assertion, I have had Occasion to mention before; and therefore shall only just take Notice here that they observe,

That *Adam* was the immediate Workmanship of God, and therefore could not but be under stronger and more affecting Impressions of his Obligations and Duty to him, than Persons who come into the World in the Way of ordinary Generation. That *Adam* received the Covenant, not remotely by Tradition from others, but immediately from the Mouth

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 77

of God himself ; which must also naturally tend to render it more impressive. That the Interest of all his Posterity, as well as his own, depended upon his demeanour in one easy Point : And that we often see, that Men out of Love and Concern for their Posterity, refrain from those Crimes, from which no Consideration of themselves could have withheld them. That either of these Considerations singly, and much more all of them together, rendered it much more likely, that *Adam* should continue stedfast in his Obedience, during his time of Probation ; than that any Man of his Posterity would, if exposed to the same or equal Temptations ; and left to the same Freedom of Will ; and not more powerfully assisted, than he was, by the preventing Grace of God. In fine, that if *Adam*, being under stronger Inducements thereto than any of his Posterity ever could have been, was to all Appearance much more likely than they, to have continued stedfast in his Obedience ; it will thence follow, that his being appointed of God to represent them, and act for them, was not only Equitable ; but in the Nature of the Thing tended more to the Good and Advantage of Mankind, than if every Man had been appointed to act for himself. And therefore, it may reasonably be supposed, that every Child of *Adam*, could it have been antecedently proposed to him, would have consented to it, and even chosen, that this Covenant should be made with *Adam*, not only for himself, but for his Posterity also. For all the Posterity of *Adam* would have tho't themselves safer, and that it was more likely they should escape Death, and be confirm'd in Life and Happiness forever, if their Interests were deposited with him, and he appointed to represent and act for them ; than if they had been appointed every one to stand or fall by himself.

Nor

78 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

Not is there any Reason to doubt, but that if *Adam* had held fast his Integrity, we should all of us have been giving Glory to God continually, for the Wisdom and Goodness of the Method he had taken, to secure the Confirmation of Holiness and Happiness to us forever. Now the Events proving otherwise, thro' *Adam's* abusing the Trust reposed in him, can't alter the Nature of the Thing it self, and render that unjust or unreasonable, which was in it self just and good and reasonable, and would have been so acknowledg'd by us, if the Event had proved favourable to us. Nor could a Foresight of the Event be any just Reason, why God should not establish the Covenant with *Adam* after this Manner. What belong'd to God was, to do that, which was in it self most likely to prevent the Apostacy and Ruin of Mankind, let the foreseen Event be what it would.

Upon the whole; Tho' the Event hath proved unhappy, yet the *Calvinists* think it plain (from the Considerations mentioned) that it was the best Thing which could be done in those Circumstances, that *Adam* should be appointed by God to represent and act for his Posterity. And accordingly, that God did set him in such a publick Capacity. And therefore they affirm,

3. That it is impossible it should be inconsistent with any of the divine Perfections, to deal with the Posterity of *Adam*, as Persons obnoxious to the Punishment denounced against him, in Case of Disobedience. For if the Terms of the Covenant were good and equitable, it can't be contrary to Equity or Goodness, or any other divine Perfection, to deal with Mankind according to them.

'Tis

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 79

'Tis true indeed the Case of Mankind is become very compassionate, since they were all involv'd in Sin and Misery by an Act of Disobedience, which they had no personal Share in. But it is as true, that God hath treated them with such Compassion, as will eternally deserve our Praise and Admiration, since he hath given his only begotten Son to redeem and save them.

I shall not proceed to any other Arguments urged by the *Arminians*, or *others*, against the Imputation of the Guilt of *Adam's* first Sin to his Posterity, from a supposed inconsistency of this Doctrine with the divine Perfections. For I have already mentioned the most weighty of them, that I have ever met with, by Way of Objection against the *Calvinists* Doctrine of the Covenant between God and *Adam*. Nor is it needful to multiply Arguments of this Sort. For one of them will determine the Controversy, as well as a thousand, if God did not appoint *Adam* to represent his Posterity and act for them, and if it was not just that he should; But if it was Equitable and Good that *Adam* should be set in such a publick Capacity, and accordingly God did so set him; it will be impossible to prove the Imputation of his Sin to his Posterity to be inconsistent with the divine Perfections. So that (as I observ'd before) the *Equitableness* and the *Reality* of a Covenant between God and *Adam*, for his Posterity as well as for himself, are the great things to be enquired into, for deciding this Controversy.

However I shall proceed to the second Thing principally insisted on by the Adversaries of the Imputation of the Guilt of *Adam's* first Sin to his Posterity; which (if it be true) is a Consideration abundantly.

80 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

abundantly sufficient alone to destroy the Credit of any Doctrine. Now this is,

2. *That the Doctrine of the Imputation of the Guilt of Adam's first Sin to his Posterity is Contradictory to the Scriptures.* For there are diverse Passages of Scripture which seem evidently to conclude for the Doctrine directly opposite. Thus,

1. *God in the Scriptures sometimes expressly forbids such a Way of Proceedure among Men, as the punishing of the Children for the Parents Sins. The Fathers (saith he) shall not be put to Death for the Children, neither shall the Children be put to Death for the Fathers. Every Man shall be put to Death for his own Sin, Deut. 24. 16.* And this Rule of Righteousness deserves to be more carefully attended by us, inasmuch as the Scriptures have taken a most signal Notice of the conscientious Respect which was once paid to it. For the sacred Historian tells us 2 Kings 14. 5, 6. *That as soon as the Kingdom of Judah was confirmed in the Hand of Amaziah, he slew his Servants, which had slain the King his Father. But the Children of the Murderers he slew not: according to that which is written in the Book of the Law of Moses, wherein the Lord commanded saying, The Fathers shall not be put to Death for the Children, nor the Children be put to Death for the Fathers; but every Man shall be put to Death, for his own Sin.* Nor is this all. For the religious Respect which King Amaziah paid to this Commandment of his God, is again mentioned to his Praise. 2 Chron. 25. 4. *He did that which was right in the Sight of the Lord. — He slew his Servants, that had killed the King his Father. But he slew not their Children, but did as it is written in the Law, in the Book of Moses, &c.* Now the double Mark of Honour set upon the Obedience of King Amaziah to this divine Command, supposes it

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 81

it to be a Rule of Righteousness of great Importance in God's Account. And therefore, it would be highly injurious to him to imagine, that he would do that himself, which (as an unrighteous thing) he hath strictly forbidden Men to do: And which, when they concientiously forbear, he is so well pleased with them for it. To this the Calvinists reply,

1. *That the Argument depends entirely upon a false Supposition: Namely, That God cannot do that justly himself, which he don't allow Men to do.* Now that this is a false Maxim, is plain from what he tells us, *Exod. 20. 5. That he is a jealous God, visiting the Iniquities of the Fathers upon the Children unto the third and fourth Generation of them that hate him:*

Again, The Falseness of the Maxim is no less evident from Fact. Since we find that God hath often dispensed with that Law, *Deut. 24. 16.* And expressly authorized Men to execute Judgment upon the Children of great Transgressors, as well as upon themselves. Thus *Joshua and all Israel, by divine Appointment, took Achan, and his Sons, and his Daughters, and stoned him with Stones, and burned them with Fire, after they had stoned them with Stones, Josh. 7. 24, 25.* And so *Jehu was anointed of God, to cut off the whole House of Ahab, 2 Kings 9. 6, 7, 8.* And we are furnished with many other such Instances in the Scriptures. And therefore, when God says, *The Children shall not be put to Death for the Fathers, every Man shall be put to Death for his own Sin,* he can only intend to set Bounds to *human Vengeance*, which otherwise might often exceed greatly; and not to *divine Justice*, which can never be influenced by unreasonable Passions. He shews what he would ordinarily have done by Men; and not what he will

M

always

82 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

always tie himself up to, or what he cannot deviate from without Injustice.

2. *The Law Deut. 24. 16. respects the Punishment of such Sins only, as Parents commit in their personal Capacities; and not as the Representatives of their Children. And therefore no Argument can reasonably be drawn from thence, against the Imputation of the Guilt of Adam's first Sin to his Posterity. For Adam was at that time set by God in a publick Capacity, to represent and act for his Posterity. And this is the Reason why they all Share with him in his Sufferings for that Sin; as they would have done in his Rewards, if he had persevered in his Duty. Whereas when Adam by that Sin, had broken Covenant with God, and so ceased any longer to stand in such a publick Capacity; his following Sins were no more imputed to his Posterity, then the Sins of our immediate Progenitors, are to us.*

But I proceed to say, that the *Arminians* argue,

2. *That God sometimes in Scripture disclaims such a Method, as the punishing Children for their Fathers Sins. He not only forbids Men to do it, but declares that he does it not himself. * Thus after God had reprimanded the Israelites, for a Proverb, which, ill founded as it was, had too generally prevail'd among them, † The Fathers have eaten sowre Grapes, and the Childrens Teeth are set on Edge; he declares in the most solemn and awful Manner, that they shall not have Occasion any more to use this Proverb, and that upon a clear and incontestible Reason of Equity. || Behold, all Souls are mine, as the Soul of the Father, so also the Soul of the Son is mine: the Soul that*

* *Dr. Fiddes, v. 1. p. 302.* † *Ezek. 18. 2.* || *Ver. 4. 20.*
sinners

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 83

sinneth it shall die. The Son shall not bear the Iniquity of the Father, neither shall the Father bear the Iniquity of the Son; the Righteousness of the Righteous shall be upon him, and the Wickedness of the Wicked shall be upon him.

† And then he goes on to appeal to the Judgment of those very Israelites who complained of the Iniquity of his dealings with them, whether he did not govern himself in this respect by the Principles of Justice and Equity? * *Hear now, O House of Israel, Are not my Ways equal?* From whence we must infer, that as the charging every Man's Sin upon himself, and not upon another, was just and equal in God's account; so the contrary to this, *viz.* the charging or imputing one Man's Sin to another, that was no way accessory thereto, is unequal and unjust in his Account also. And as God declar'd by the Mouth of his Prophet, that he would deal equally with his Creatures in this respect, by charging the Guilt of every Man's Sin upon himself, and not upon another; so whoever asserts otherwise of God, is guilty of Slander and false Accusation against the most High; and consequently God will not impute Adam's Sin to his Posterity.

To strengthen all this, it may be observ'd further, that these Passages in Ezekiel are not a *single Declaration* of the Method of God's Proceedure in his judicial Dealings with Men; but we are told to the same Purpose, Jer. 31. 29, 30. *They shall say no more, the Fathers have eaten a sower Grape, and the Childrens Teeth are set on Edge. But every one shall die for his own Iniquity, every Man that eateth the sower Grape, his Toe shall be set on edge.*

To these Texts thus alledged the Calvinists say,

† Chubb's Tracts p. 94, 95. * Ver. 28, 29.

84 An Enquiry into the Truth of the

1. That they ought not to be understood as always true, according to the strictness of the letter of them. Thus, when it is said, *the Soul that sins shall die, and every one shall die for his own Iniquity*, it cannot intend, that this is always the Case; for that would be to contradict the Redemption of sinful Men by the Death of Christ, upon whom *the Lord hath laid the Iniquities of us all*; and who was cut off, not for himself; but that *whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting Life*. And so again, when it is said, *the Son shall not bear the Iniquity of the Father*, it cannot mean that he never shall, let his Behaviour be what it will; for this would be to contradict the second Commandment, in which God expressly tells us, that *he visits the Iniquities of the Fathers upon the Children unto the third and fourth Generation of them that hate him*. And therefore,

2. This Passage ought to be expounded of such Children only, as do not walk in the evil Ways of their Fathers; but forsake them, and abhor them. And thus God himself expressly determines his own Meaning. If the Son seeth all his Fathers Sins, which he hath done, and considereth, and doeth not such like; he shall not die for the Iniquity of his Father, he shall surely live, Ezek. 18. 14, 17. And so again Verse 19, *When the Son hath done that which is lawful and right, and hath kept all my Statutes, and hath done them, he shall surely live*. But now this is not naturally the Case of any of the Posterity of Adam. For they are all Transgressors from the Womb, and go on obstinately in their Trespases, till the Grace of God prevents and reclaims them.

3. If what is false was true, that God now never visited the Iniquities of the Fathers upon the Children; yet this would not prove, that he don't impute Adam's first Sin to his Posterity. For it is not pretended that our im-
mediate

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 85

mediate Progenitors are set by God in such a public Capacity to represent us, and act for us; as *Adam* was appointed to do for his Posterity.

We may now observe,

2. *That some have tho't sundry Passages in the New Testament to be irreconcilable with the Doctrine of the Imputation of the Guilt of Adam's Sin to his Posterity.* Thus for Instance,

1. *Our blessed Lord saith concerning little Children, Matth. 19. 14. That of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.* Now how could these little Children have a Right to the Kingdom of Heaven, if they were under the Guilt of *Adam's* first Sin, and bound to sustain the Penalty of it? To which it is answered,

That nothing was transmitted to them from *Adam* but Sin, and Guilt, and Misery: That therefore their Title to the *Kingdom of Heaven*, was not derived to them by any natural or covenant Right from him; but was entirely owing to the Election of Grace, and to the Covenant of God with their Father *Abraham*, which included his Seed with him; according to what we read, *Gen. 17. 7. I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed after thee, in their Generations, for an everlasting Covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy Seed after thee.* Again it is further alledged,

2. *That now under the Gospel Dispensation, wherever either of the Parents is a Believer, the Children are said to be holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14.* Now whether this intends real, or only federal Holiness, it but ill agrees with the Supposition, that they are under the Wrath and Curse of God, upon the Account of *Adam's* Sin. To which it is replied,

That

86 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

*That the same Apostle elsewhere assures us that all, both Jews and Gentiles, are by nature Children of Wrath, Eph. 2. 3. And therefore, if the Children of believing Gentiles are in any Sense holy, it must be entirely owing to the Grace of God, Who when we were Enemies, hath reconciled us to himself, by the Death of his Son; who hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for us, that the Blessing of Abraham (namely of being a God unto him, and to his Seed after him) might come upon the Gentiles thro' Jesus Christ *. It is hardly worth while to mention,*

3. The Answer of our Saviour to that strange Question of his Disciples, Joh. 9. 2. Master, who did Sin, this Man, or his Parents, that he was born blind? For when he replies, Ver. 3. Neither hath this Man sinned, nor his Parents; but that the Works of God should be made manifest in him: It is plain he cannot intend, that the Parents of this Man were as free from Sin as the Man himself was before he was born; because that would be to contradict what the wise Man tells us, Eccl. 7. 20. That there is not a just Man upon Earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not. And much less can he intend, that God never takes Occasion from the Sins of Parents to bring Calamities upon their Children; for that would be to contradict the most express and solemn Declaration of God himself, Exod. 20. 5. that he visits the Iniquities of the Fathers upon the Children unto the third and fourth Generation. And least of all can he intend, that God don't impute the Guilt of the Sin of Adam to his Posterity: for that is a Sense to which his Words can never be stretch'd; and which his Disciples neither asked, nor at that time tho't any thing about. The obvious Meaning of our Lord therefore is, that the Blindness of this

* Rom. 5. 10. Gal. 3. 13, 14.

Imputation of Adam's first Sin. 37

poor Man, was not inflicted by God, as a Punishment of any Sin, either of his own, or of his Parents; but only that an Opportunity might hereby be given, for a glorious Manifestation of the Goodness and Power of God upon him.

I have now, either by way of Objection, or of Argument, faithfully represented (so far as they have fallen within my Notice) the principal things urged against the Imputation of the Guilt of *Adam's* first Sin to his Posterity, by the Adversaries of that Doctrine. Upon which I shall just remark,

That their great Strength don't lie so much in what they argue from the Scriptures that have been, or any others that can be mentioned; as it does in what they argue from the seeming Inconsistency of the Doctrine of the Imputation, &c. with many of the divine Perfections: And that their Arguments of this Sort, have too much Force in them to be withstood upon any other Principle, then that of a Covenant of God with *Adam* for his Posterity as well as for himself: But if this Principle be true (as I think I have prov'd it is) all Opposition to the Doctrine deduced from it, must fall before it.

I shall not now enter into the Consideration of the second Proposition contained in the Article before us, which is,

That the same Death in Sin and corrupted Nature, which beset our first Parents upon their eating the forbidden Fruit, was convey'd to all their Posterity descending from them by ordinary Generation *. But I shall hasten to dispatch, in as few Words as may be, so much of

* Two Discourses upon this second Proposition, are here omitted, because nothing concerning that Subject was mentioned in the Proposals to the Subscribers.

88 *An Enquiry into the Truth of the*

the third and last Proposition, as relates to the Enquiry I have been upon ; namely,

3. *That one Ground of the Imputation of the Guilt of the abovementioned Sin of our first Parents to all their Posterity by ordinary Generation, was their being the Root of all Mankind.*

I only say that it is *one Ground*, because I apprehend that this Matter is to be principally resolved into the sovereign Will of God : for there was no Necessity in the Nature of the Thing, that it should follow from Mankinds being all sprung from one Root. The immediate Reason of the Imputation of the Guilt of the Sin of our first Parents, is their being appointed of God to represent their Posterity, and act for them. Now however suitable and proper this might be ; yet I think no Man may presume to say, that God could not, consistently enough with the Honour of all his Perfections, have appointed Mankind, as he did the Angels, every one to stand or fall by himself ; without constituting their common Head their common Representative also.

And yet on the other Hand, if God had created all Mankind at once, as he did the Angels, it is not at all probable, that he would have appointed any one Person to represent and act for them all ; nor could there have been the same, or other as good Reasons, why he should do so ; as there were for his appointing *Adam* to represent and act for his Posterity. So that we may very well conclude, that *Adam's being the Root of all Mankind was one*, tho' not the only, nor the principal Ground of the Imputation of the Guilt of his first Sin to them. And thus much may suffice for the *Explication and Reason* of

of that Part of the third Proposition which relates to the preceeding Enquiry.

I shall now conclude this Subject, which I have dwelt so long upon, with two Words by Way of Improvement, namely,

1. *That the very weighty Considerations, which are offer'd on both Sides of the Controversy, which I have here debated, should be a strong Argument for mutual Charity, with those who differ in their Apprehensions concerning it. Since so many things, and things of so much Importance, may be urged on both Sides of the Question; it cannot be tho't strange, that serious Enquirers, after their most diligent Search into the Matter, should yet remain divided in their Sentiments about it. Now on both Heads they profess a Concern for the Honour of the Attributes of their common Lord; and their Concern for this, and their Inability to defend it, otherwise than upon their own Schemes respectively, are the Considerations which lead them into such a Contrariety of Sentiments to each other. Let not him then, who does not believe the Doctrine of the Imputation of Adam's first Sin to his Posterity, despise him who believes it; and let not him who believes it, judge him who believes it not.*

2. *Let no Man prejudice himself or others against this Doctrine, by being too positive in Matters of which he hath no Certainty. In particular you ought to beware of boldly determining the future Milery of such as die before they have been guilty of actual Sin. For who can tell how many of them may belong to the Election of Grace? Or indeed, who can prove, that they were not all chosen in Christ before the Foundation of the World, and predestinated to the Adoption of Children.*

N

So As to the *Light*

See by the Now tho' I have not Scriptur^e Light enough to dare to affirm they were; yet if no Man can prove that they were not, no Man may turn his uncertain Conjectures about them, into Matter of Objection or Prejudice against a Doctrin^e, which hath been well proved to him. Our uncertain Suppositions about such things as God hath tho't fit to keep secret, ought never to be opposed to any Truth which he hath been pleased to reveal.

F I N I S.



20 JY 64

E R R A T A.

P Age 7. line 8. for Possitive read Positive. P. 10. l. 20. r. prove. p. 11. l. 8. r. Turretine. p. 24. l. 12. insert *before Sin.* p. 33. l. 19. r. affecting. p. 34. l. 29. for or r. p. 35. l. 2. insert *and* before *wherever*. p. 60. l. 13. r. Gentleman. l. 17. r. Gentleman. p. 63. l. 25. r. Gentleman. p. 71. l. 21. r. import. *immoderate*